CHISWICK AREA COMMITTEE (PLANNING)

A meeting of the Chiswick Area Committee (Planning) will be held in The Hogarth Hall, Chiswick Town Hall, Heathfield Terrace, Chiswick W4 on Wednesday, 25 May 2005 at 7:30 pm

MEMBERSHIP
Councillor Thompson- Chair

AGENDA

Municipal Business

1. Election of Chair and Vice-Chair of the Area Committee

2. Election of member of the Sustainable Development Committee and member of the Community Investment Advisory Panel

Apologies and Other Communications

3. Apologies for absence, declarations of interest or any other communications from Members

Minutes

4. Minutes of the meeting held on 6 April 2005 (Pages 1 - 15)

Speakers

5. Items on which there are speakers

Protocol for Speakers

i) Members of the public, objectors and applicants must contact the Committee Administrator, Carol Stiles on 020 8583 2066 with details of the proposed submission no later than 5.00pm on the Thursday prior to the Committee meeting. The Chair will decide whether or not to grant the request to speak.

ii) For planning applications, the applicants will only be allowed to speak if there is an objector who wishes to address the Area Committee. In exceptional circumstances the Chair may agree that an applicant who would significantly add to the information already available will be allowed to speak at the Area Committee in the absence of an objector. If refusal is recommended then speakers would not normally be permitted.

iii) For all highway matters, if there are members of the public with opposing views regarding the proposal the Chair will allow both sides to speak. Generally, speakers will only be allowed to speak on issues where funding is available.

iv) With regard to planning applications, where both parties address the Area Committee the
order of speaking will be the applicants followed by the objectors.

v) Each party will be given no more than five minutes to speak.

vi) The Area Committee will consider submissions on up to six items: 3 planning applications and 3 highways matters.

**Planning Applications for Decision**

Applications that have been received under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990

6. 38 Cleveland Avenue *(Pages 16 - 19)*

7. 8 Belmont Terrace *(Pages 20 - 26)*

**Planning Applications for Comment**

8. 331-335 Chiswick High Road *(Pages 27 - 35)*

9. Chiswick Lodge *(Pages 36 - 45)*

   The printed copy of this report was circulated as a late report separate from the main agenda.

**Other Planning Matters**

10. Planning Applications Decided under Officers' Delegated Powers *(Pages 46 - 58)*

11. Delegated Decisions: Trees with Tree Preservation Orders (TPOs) or in a Conservation Area

   The printed copy of this report was circulated as a late report separate from the main agenda.

12. Planning Appeals *(Pages 72 - 74)*

   This document was printed separately to the main agenda as a Supplementary item.

**Highways and Traffic Issues**

13. Request for a zebra crossing outside the Chiswick Health Centre, Dolman Road *(Pages 75 - 77)*

14. Proposal to Stop up the highway serving Sutton Court, Chiswick *(Pages 78 - 80)*

15. Highways Maintenance Programme 2005-2006 *(Pages 81 - 85)*

**Other Matters**

16. Addendum Report *(Page 86)*

   *An Addendum report will be published shortly before the meeting with any additional information relating to agenda items not available at the time of publication of the main agenda.*
17. Urgent Business

Any business which the Chair agrees to accept on grounds of urgency.

DECLARING INTERESTS

Committee members are reminded that if they have a personal interest in any matter being discussed at the meeting they must declare the interest and if the interest is also a prejudicial interest then they may not take part in any discussion or vote on the matter. If applicants or objectors on any application have contacted Members, they must also declare this fact.

T.WELSH, Assistant Chief Executive (Legal), London Borough of Hounslow, Civic Centre, Lampton Road, Hounslow TW3 4DN

12 May 2005
At a meeting of the Chiswick Area Committee (Planning) held on Wednesday, 6 April 2005 at 7:30 pm at The Hogarth Hall, Chiswick Town Hall, Heathfield Terrace, Chiswick W4.

Present:
Councillor Thompson (Chair)
Councillors Barwood, Davies, Kinghorn, Lee, Lynch, McGregor and Oulds.

Apologies for Absence
Councillors Day.

143. Apologies for absence, declarations of interest or any other communications from Members
The Chair opened the meeting, welcoming all present to the newly refurbished Town Hall. It was noted that all members of the Committee had received correspondence in respect of the following items:
- Compass House
- 214 Chiswick High Road
- The John Bull Public House
- Lovell House
- Heron House.

144. Minutes
(i) Minutes of the meeting held on 5 January 2005
The minutes of the meeting held on 5 January 2005 were confirmed.

There were the following matters arising:

The Chair drew members’ attention to the fact that the planning applications Item 107 – Corner of Acton Lane/Essex Place and Item 108 – The Bowling Green, Gunnersbury Park, Popes Lane were both approved by the Sustainable Development Committee. The application discussed at Item 109 – Land between Kew Bridge, Kew Bridge Road and the River Thames (also known as Scottish Widows Site), Brentford was refused.

In respect of Item 112- 78 Park Drive, Acton, Adam Beamish, Enforcement Officer, reported that the Council had now received a retrospective planning application.

(ii) Minutes of the meeting held on 23 February 2005
The minutes of the meeting held on 23 February 2005 were confirmed.

There were the following matters arising:

Item 132, page 31: Former Public Conveniences
Further discussion with the applicants was required. There would be a meeting of key officers to progress the issue the following week. Meanwhile, the report had been withdrawn and would be brought back when the Council and the applicant were happy that outstanding issues had been resolved.

Item 136, page 35: Traffic Item: CPZ
The Chair reported that the proposed change agreed by members to the CPZ for residents of Linden Gardens would be implemented by the end of April.
145. **Items on which there are speakers**

The Chair had agreed to take speakers on one item
– Compass House, 61 Strand-on-the-Green.

146. **Compass House, 61 Strand-on-the-Green**

See the report of the Borough Planning Officer – Agenda Item 4 and the addendum report.

Mr Gatehouse, Director of the Architects McMorran and Gatehouse, and agent for the applicant, addressed the Committee. Copies of illustrations were projected for members’ information.

Mr Gatehouse explained that this was not the first application proposed and the applicant and architects had been working with officers, English Heritage and neighbours over a long period of time and now believed that they had established appropriate, reasonable alterations to the original plans. The application was now for a small, rear ground floor extension and to replace deteriorating windows. There was no change to the porch. There were also appropriate changes to the kitchen area. The architects believed that they had addressed the concerns of officers, neighbours, English Heritage and the Strand-on-the-Green Association.

Plans of the original building were circulated to members. Mr Gatehouse drew members’ attention to the fact that Compass House was four-five feet higher than the adjacent properties. For this reason the revised plans lowered the extension floor below the garden level to the level of the existing rear bay window to prevent loss of light. Mr Gatehouse referred to the relative levels. The rear elevation showed the design to have an area of flat roof by the boundary. The reason for this was to ensure that the existing angle of daylight was not breached and there was no loss of daylight. The rear extension design also compared with that of other nearby properties.

Mr Gatehouse was aware that there had been confusion about the intentions with regard to the windows. He confirmed that where rotten, all existing windows would be replaced as existing, with the exception of one steel metal window, which would be replaced with traditional timber.

Mr Gatehouse explained that his architectural practice regularly undertook work to renew and refurbish windows, including in historical and listed buildings. Indeed their work with such buildings had been recognised by the Civic Trust. Mr Gatehouse explained that it was his client’s intention to conserve the building, whilst being able to use it in a fashion befitting the 21st century.

The Chair invited questions from members.

Councillor Davies asked about the source of the map Mr Gatehouse had circulated and was advised that this was an 1865 map from Chiswick Reference Library, showing the shape of the building as it was up to 1920. Councillor Davies noted that there was no indication of the depth of the old outhouse. Mr Gatehouse explained that this was an addition to the building but the point being made related to the comparison with the original building. Historically the area of the garden had been significantly less than existed today. Hence they would argue that the extension was reasonable in relation to the site.

Councillor Davies noted that reference had been made to the extension before 1936 but the objector said the extension was added after 1948. Mr Gatehouse explained that 1948 was a point of reference in Planning terms. The 1865 map had been used to illustrate the footprint of the building as an indicator of the extent of development at the rear.
Councillor Davies also noted that Mr Gatehouse had talked of the design being in sympathy with the period of the property, but she considered that it looked quite modern in appearance, with large panes of glass. Mr Gatehouse replied that all properties in the area had taken on different forms and appearance with their rear additions. The proposed materials were pantiles and brick of the period, with the exception of the large doors. He suggested that architecture was evolving, that the principle adhered to the architectural form, but that details to accommodate modern day living were acceptable. He believed that buildings of immense value were looked after and loved when they responded to how the owners wished to live. He believed the design was fundamentally in keeping with the architectural feel of the property but with one or two details to reflect 21st century living.

Councillor Lynch noted the architects had spoken of a track record in dealing with historical buildings and asked whether they had dealt with English Heritage concerning the whole of the house, since he was aware that some features of the interior required careful handling. Mr Gatehouse stated that there had been unsympathetic alterations internally in the 1960s. As architects they had met with English Heritage to identify areas that were historically important to retain and had adapted plans to suit. There had been constructive dialogue and a positive response.

Councillor Lynch advised that he had visited the property. He was aware of a number of sets of plans and an iterative process. He asked how many sets of plans there had been and whether the obstacles had been addressed.

Mr Gatehouse explained that his clients wished to use the property as a single-family home with a cottage in the garden. Originally they had discussed extending the cottage but officers had felt that this would be too much development. His clients had accepted this. A proposal for a larger extension had been reduced in size to address issues and after the first designs it had been proposed to sink the rear addition to prevent loss of light. Hence significant changes had been made as a result of dialogue, with the intention of being pragmatic and sensitive for the building to be a credit to Strand-on-the-Green.

The Chair invited Mr Acton-Bond, resident of the neighbouring property, No. 1 The Moorings, to address the Committee. Mr Acton-Bond used a stick to demonstrate the additional height of the wall next to his property. He explained that his primary objection related to loss of light. However, other factors had been set out in the letter circulated to all members and he would not repeat those. Mr Acton-Bond explained that he had not seen the intermediate plans. The original plans of 1865 showed that all five of the current terrace houses had been on the site of a malt house. His property had been built in 1928 when the 1865 outhouses were not there. Currently there was an eight feet high wall situated close to their kitchen window. The plans would add a foot or so at the side on the line of the wall. He believed that the extension would make a significant difference to the amount of light to the kitchen, the family room and a bedroom above, causing undue adverse impact. In respect of the garden aspect, Mr Acton-Bond noted that the garden of Compass House was 4 ½ feet shorter than adjoining gardens. Whilst he had every sympathy for the applicants and considered Compass House a lovely house, he was concerned about the impact on his property and the difficulties with certain plans for the community as a whole. Mr Acton-Bond was relieved to hear that the windows were to go back as they were.

Mr Acton-Bond made reference to an ODPM booklet in respect of Planning Applications that suggested it was appropriate to consult neighbours before submitting plans. There had been no such consultation but in discussion with the Planning Officer, it had been said that if the application were lower than the existing wall there would be no problem. In fact Mr Acton-Bond’s window was now 40cm from the wall and would become closer with the development. The extension would be sunk but not to the level of the adjoining house.
To do so would make more provision for light into 1 The Moorings. The change in the plans from a lean-to to the present proposal for the roof was a marked improvement, but the flat roof would be 6 inches higher adjacent to the boundary, with pan tiles and a lantern further in.

Mr Gatehouse commented that he could not vouchsafe for the accuracy of the drawing Mr Acton-Bond was displaying to members. Mr Acton-Bond did not claim that the drawing was an architects' drawing but wished to give an impression of the impact of the plans. He questioned whether the creation of a large kitchen, which did not currently exist in the property, could be justified at the expense of such impact on neighbours. He noted the application met the guidelines, but believed that the needs of other residents must be taken into account. The Planning Officer referred to terraced properties, but Mr Acton-Bond drew attention to the fact that normally this would mean similar properties in a row, whilst in this case Compass House was very different from 1 The Moorings.

The Chair invited questions from members.

Councillor Lee asked whether there had been attempts to negotiate a compromise with the other party. Mr Acton-Bond informed members that he had discussed the then plans in May 2004 but since that date there had been no approach from the applicants and he believed that it was for them to approach him, although he would prefer to limit the extent of the disagreement.

Marilyn Smith, Area Planning Manager, advised members that there were two applications, one for Listed Building Consent for the internal works and window changes and one for Planning Consent for the rear extension. The extension at 3.05m deep was in accordance with the guidelines. The roof progressed from a flat roof to a pitched roof, to a mono-pitched glazed roof to a lantern to reduce the impact. The garden was higher than that of adjacent neighbours and the extension would be sunken to reduce the impact, although there would be an increase in height. On the other side, the outbuilding would reduce any impact. A bay window, not shown on plans until the 1960s, was to be removed. The extension would be two metres more but on the boundary. The Conservation Officer was satisfied that the design was in accordance with the guidelines. Ms Smith stressed that the 3.05m depth, the sunken floor and the flat roof had all been designed to reduce the impact. She was happy to add a condition to clarify the position with the windows.

Councillor Davies expressed concern about the Listed Building Consent and asked who had been consulted about the removal of chimneybreasts. It was confirmed that the Conservation Officer had approved the work but they were not in fact being removed. In response to a question from Councillor Barwood it was also confirmed that the small greenhouse on the other boundary would be incorporated into the house, that this part of the extension would have a mono-pitched glazed canopy and that the number of habitable rooms was not known.

The Chair invited discussion on the application.

Councillor Lynch commented that this was a difficult and intricate problem. Mr Acton-Bond had not exaggerated in demonstrating the height of the wall outside his window. Councillor Lynch informed the Committee that when the first proposal had been mooted, he had visited No. 1 The Moorings and had thought the proposal oppressive. It was to the credit of the architect and the Planning Officer that they had shown the imagination to lower the floor and move the roof away. He had sympathy with Mr and Mrs Acton-Bond because there was a dark area at the side of the house, but he suggested that this was how the house was built. Councillor Lynch believed that an application to build No.1 The Moorings today would probably be refused. He was sympathetic because the family had lack of light already, but there were also the rights of people to build a modest extension.
Most of the arguments related to the size of the extension and loss of light. Councillor Lynch believed that members should support the application, since they had been told by the architect that plans had been through several iterations and officers had moved the application in the right direction. He moved approval, which was seconded by the Chair.

Councillor Kinghorn reported that he had also visited both houses. He believed that the application constituted gross over-development and was concerned that the garden would be reduced from 90% to 70%. There was already a 1990s addition to the back of the house and a single storey cottage to a three-storey house. The old map showed a malt house not houses and therefore, Councillor Kinghorn did not consider this relevant. Also the standards of 1865 were not so generous.

Councillor Kinghorn’s main concern related to loss of light. He accepted the extension was within the guidelines but suggested that whilst this might not reduce light where there was a wide fronted house, this was a narrow terrace house so that the size of the extension would lead to loss of light. He did not believe that the fact that it was dark already was a reason to make it darker. Councillor Kinghorn noted that the Committee had previously considered the issues related to the impact of extensions on narrow terrace properties when what was permitted within the guidelines might not be acceptable in respect of the affect on the neighbouring property, particularly as some residents preferred north light.

Councillor Kinghorn understood the wall would be 12-15 inches higher and a foot beyond the present building line and, therefore, would reduce light considerably. That buildings survive and live was fair comment, but not at the expense of everyone around. If the house was not big enough, the answer was to find a house elsewhere. Councillor Kinghorn accepted that the applicants had made significant changes but he still believed the application would have a detrimental effect. Mr Acton-Bond had made the point that there might be improvement if the extension was sunk to the level of the adjacent property, but the application was still over-development. Had acceptance not been moved, Councillor Kinghorn would have moved refusal on grounds of loss of garden amenity space, loss of light to the neighbours and over-development.

Councillor Lee thanked both presenters. He tended to side with Councillor Kinghorn, believing that the light would be blocked out. He also felt that there had been insufficient consultation to find a compromise. He found Mr Acton-Bond’s case convincing, namely that there would be detriment to the enjoyment of his property through over-development of the site.

Councillor Barwood noted that the current garden at 67.5 square metres was small for the size of the house. It was for this reason that she had asked about the number of habitable rooms. Members did not know why the original extension had been given permission but she believed that there was already looking and would have moved refusal.

The Chair moved to a vote on the two sets of proposals, namely that for Planning Consent and that for Listed Building Consent. A vote for approval of Proposal A was not carried, with two in favour and six against. Hence that application was refused. A vote for approval of Proposal B was also not carried, with three in favour and five against. Hence this consent was also refused.

The Planning Application was refused on grounds of over-development, loss of amenity in respect of the garden and loss of light. The Listed Building Consent was also refused because the application included demolition of the existing rear extension bay, not just internal works.
Resolved:

1. That Application No. 01076/61/P6 for erection of single storey rear extension to main house be refused on grounds of over-development, loss of amenity in respect of the garden and loss of light;

2. and that No. 01076/61/L4 for Listed Building Consent for demolition of existing rear extension bay and side wall to corridor on ground floor, part demolition of bathroom wall on 2nd floor level, replacement or refurbishment of existing windows/doors to south elevation incorporating internal alterations to main house be refused because the application includes demolition of the existing rear bay not just internal works.

147. 214 Chiswick High Road

See the report of the Borough Planning Officer – Agenda Item 5 – and the Addendum report.

The Area Planning Manager, Marilyn Smith, reported that the application sought permission for a shop front and a sign. She clarified to members that the change of use from public house to restaurant did not need planning permission as both were A3 use.

The original proposal had been for an open shop front and this had been a matter of concern in respect of noise. However, the plan had been amended and was now a traditional shop front with a lobby door and suspended canopy to prevent noise to the flats above.

The advertisement consisted of six letters internally illuminated. There had been objections in respect of light pollution but the light would not be sufficiently intense to cause problems for the residents above.

Councillor Lee reported that he had been besieged with questions suggesting that the pub was to be converted to a live sex club, although he understood it to be a restaurant. Ms Smith advised that the company Ballans had venues in Soho and Kensington and was a restaurant.

Councillor Kinghorn noted that the application included glass blocks facing Windmill Road and he considered this feature unattractive. Ms Smith explained that translucent glass blocks were proposed to let in light.

Councillor Barwood sought to clarify that there was no provision for outdoor dining. Ms Smith confirmed that this application was not for that, although there was solicitors’ correspondence on this point. Councillor Barwood had received calls from residents of the flats above. She asked whether they had been consulted and understood that the main objection currently was to the canopy. The Area Planning Manager replied that the Planning Office had not received objections to the canopy, but confirmed that residents of the flats had been consulted, together with the Management Company solicitor. Objectors had been sent letters to inform them that the application would be considered at this meeting.

Councillor Lynch noted that the application was not within a Conservation Area so considerations of appearance were not material to the decision. However, he wished to clarify what members were being asked to decide and whether this was a change in the arrangement of the door. Ms Smith clarified that the original application sought folding glass doors to give an open frontage. There had been an objection to this. The application was now for a solid section with windows above. The only access in and out would be through a door.
In response to a question from Councillor Davies, Ms Smith advised that the letters for the sign would be approximately 9 inches high.

Councillor Oulds was unhappy with the appearance of the proposal, which he considered to be gawdy, futuristic and ugly. The Chair noted that there were two parts to the recommendations in the report and called for a vote on each part in turn. A vote for approval of recommendation A for the shop front was carried, with three members in favour and one against. A vote for approval of recommendation B for the advertising sign was carried, with three in favour and two against.

Resolved:


148. 295 Chiswick High Road

See the report of the Borough Planning Officer – Agenda Item 6.

The Area Planning Manager informed members that the site consisted of a terrace with commercial at ground floor and residential above. There were mews to the side. All of the terrace properties had rear extensions but some had two storey rear extensions, whilst some had only one storey. This application was for a two-storey rear extension to add a small room to provide an extra bathroom. Officers considered there would be no impact on the street scene as the new extension would be next to and concealed by an existing two-storey rear extension.

The row of mews buildings were used for light industrial purposes. Planning permission had been granted to convert these to four live/work units but this had not been implemented. The objection was from the mews on the grounds that the extension would affect the light to the approved live/work units that are not yet built. Although this was a material planning consideration, the extension was not directly in front of any windows and it was not considered that the extension would affect light.

Councillor Barwood sought to clarify that there was a two-storey extension on the adjacent building and that the new extension would be built on top of the existing roof. The Area Planning Manager confirmed that this was the case.

Councillor McGregor moved approval of the application. This was seconded by Councillor Lynch. A vote for approval was carried, with five in favour. Councillor Lee abstained.

Resolved:

That Application No. 248/295/P3 P/2005/0092 for erection of rear extension on first floor to existing flat (Turnham Green Conservation Area) be approved, subject to the conditions in the report.

149. 21 Ellesmere Road

See the report of the Borough Planning Officer – Agenda Item 7 – and the Addendum report.
The application was for a single storey rear extension and conversion of the property from nine bed-sits to one two-bedroom flat on the ground floor and one three-bedroom flat on the upper floor, with a rebuild of the conservatory. An objection had been received from Beechwood Court to the rear, concerning rear access, but this was not part of the proposal. No parking was proposed but the number of units would be reduced from nine to two.

Councillor Davies questioned whether the application was setting precedents for flats in residential areas. She noted that the report mentioned three houses that had been converted to flats in Ellesmere Road and asked how many houses were in the road. The Area Planning Manager did not have a figure but noted that three had received planning consent and that the officer, in considering figures for the report, had considered only one side of the road.

Councillor Kinghorn accepted that the application would take the property out of use as a single family house, but suggested that very few families seeking that size of house would want to live along the A4. He believed that the conversion to two flats would be an improvement on the dilapidated state of the house in multiple-occupancy and supported the application.

Councillor Lynch also expressed his support. He noted that the current arrangement of using the conservatory for two bed-sits was unsatisfactory and was aware from his knowledge of the area that most properties were in multiple-occupancy or purposely converted to flats.

Councillor Oulds asked whether it would be possible to treat the application as in two parts in order to consider the conversion from bed-sits to family dwellings separate from the issue of the rear extension. The Borough Solicitor's representative, Roy Pinney, advised that this had been submitted as one application and so would stand or fall as one. Councillor Oulds explained that whilst he supported the conversion to flats, he had reservations about the rear extension.

A vote for approval was carried, with six in favour, one against and one abstention.

Resolved:

That Application No. 392/21/P2 P/2005/0030 for conversion of house in multiple occupation to one 2-bedroom flat on the ground floor and one 3-bedroom first floor flat, incorporating new window on the side elevation and rebuilding of the existing single storey side/rear infill extension (Chiswick House Conservation Area) be approved, subject to the conditions in the report, and the amended drawing numbers in the addendum report.

150. 49 Prebend Gardens

See the report of the Borough Planning Officer – Agenda Item 8.

This property was one half of a pair of semi-detached houses. It would be visible from behind from the public car park in Welstead Road, but a Tree Preservation Order (TPO) had been placed on the trees in the rear garden and these would reduce the visual impact from the car park. The application was for a single storey rear extension, side dormer and rear dormer. The size of the dormer accorded with the guidelines within a Conservation Area. There were similar developments in the adjacent terrace. An objector had raised concerns about the impact on light but the parapet wall had now been reduced and the depth of the proposed extension at 2.3m was below the usual guideline of 3.65m.
Councillor Oulds asked whether the type of windows could be conditioned to ensure that the design used was window panes with a lattice frame rather than the plane glass dormers installed nearby. The Borough Solicitor’s representative, Mr Pinney, confirmed that condition B5 in the report incorporated Councillor Oulds’ requirement, in requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with approved plans.

Councillor McGregor noted that there had been an objection from the residents of 47 Prebend Gardens about light. He noted that the property abutted the railway and sought reassurance that the amenity value for the neighbours would not be damaged and that they would secure adequate light. The Area Planning Manager advised that 49 was to the north of 47 and hence not considered to affect sunlight. The height had been reduced and the depth minimised. Also the boundary veered away from the windows of 47 Prebend Gardens.

Councillor Kinghorn commented that these were wide houses, with room to let in light. He asked how high the wall between the two properties would be in relation to the extension and was advised that the height would be higher than the existing fence, although the fence could be up to 2m without permission. The height would be 3.5m at the ridge and then reduced. Councillor Kinghorn surmised from this that the height would not be significantly above what could be put up without permission. He did not think this would have a significant impact.

A vote for approval was carried unanimously.

Resolved:
That Application No. P/2005/0103 893/49/P1 for demolition of existing rear extension and erection of single storey rear extension and roof extension incorporating rear and side dormer window to dwellinghouse be approved, subject to the conditions in the report.

151. 590 Chiswick High Road (John Bull Public House and Car Park)
See the report of the Borough Planning Officer – Agenda Item 9 – and the Addendum report.

The Chair and Councillor Barwood declared that they would not comment on the application, but would reserve the right to speak as members of the Sustainable Development Committee. Members were advised that the application had been called to the Sustainable Development Committee by a councillor in Hounslow Central ward.

Marilyn Smith, Area Planning Manager, advised that the application submitted in November had been refused under delegated powers. There had been a subsequent meeting with the applicants and the revised application had been submitted. The terrace of houses had been reduced to five rather than six houses. There were no other changes. The design was for a three- storey terrace house with a pitched roof increasing the height. Although the terrace had been moved 2m further away from Silver Crescent, the increased height overlooking the two storey houses in the adjacent street, did not address the concerns about the bulk and impact on residents in Silver Crescent.

The report dispatched to meet the required deadlines had not been able to incorporate all the correspondence received and this was now included in the Addendum report. There had been an additional letter of objection on the grounds that the development was not subservient to the existing properties in Silver Crescent.
There had also been letters of support. However, the Area Planning Manager believed that some of the comments in these letters were based on misunderstandings. The scheme was described as five mews cottages, but the houses proposed were not low rise but higher than the original application and the adjacent houses in Silver Crescent. Also it was not true that if the application were refused, the John Bull Public House building would be demolished. Planning permission would be required to demolish the building. The letter, circulated to members, from the West Chiswick and Gunnersbury Society requested a condition to retain the billiard hall and features, but such a condition was not possible because the current application was to demolish and rebuild the billiard hall.

The Area Planning Manager drew attention to the reasons for refusal for the original application, as set out in paragraph 4.4 of the report. The only change from the previous application related to a reduction in the number of houses, a revised design and their position away from the boundary. However, the position remained due south of the gardens in Silver Crescent and the increased height did not overcome the concerns about the impact on those residents.

Members raised concerns that a councillor outside the area had called the application to the Sustainable Development Committee and were confused as to why the application would be determined by the Sustainable Development Committee rather than the Area Committee. Members also expressed concern about the intensive lobbying by the developer in this case and whether such canvassing was appropriate. Councillor Lee also noted the lobbying from residents, including a co-opted member of the Area Committee, for support of the application.

Roy Pinney, on behalf of the Borough Solicitor, together with the Area Planning Manager, informed members that any member of the Sustainable Development Committee could call in a major application, providing the member gave a tangible reason, that the reason did not have to be planning grounds but could be procedural or related to public interest and that this application with 12 units was considered as a major application and hence could be refused under delegated powers but could only be approved by the Sustainable Development Committee. Mr Pinney also advised that developers were at liberty to approach councillors but members were obliged to declare that contact.

The Area Planning Manager confirmed that Councillor Whatley had called in the application according to the proper procedure and shared with members his reasons for doing so, which related to the level of public support, including that of the West Chiswick and Gunnersbury Society.

Councillor Kinghorn expressed concern about the criticism of officers implied in the letter circulated from the West Chiswick and Gunnersbury Society in respect of the use of delegated powers. He wished to clarify that those powers had been delegated by members and were applied within established guidelines and criteria. Councillor Kinghorn and Councillor McGregor stated that they fully supported the decision of officers under delegated powers.
Members made the following comments to be reported to the Sustainable Development Committee:

- The revised design of the houses seemed to be more sympathetic but more details of the materials to be used were required to judge this properly.
- The scheme is considered to be over-development.
- There were concerns about density.
- The principle concern is the overbearing height and the impact on residents in Silver Crescent.
- There are concerns about overlooking and overshadowing, taking morning sun, as the development will be close to the back of houses in Silver Crescent.
- The present application did not overcome the problems inherent in the first application.
- The desire of the West Chiswick and Gunnersbury Society to retain the billiard hall is not an option in this application.

Resolved:
That the above comments be reported to the Sustainable Development Committee.

152. Lovell House, 610-624 Chiswick High Road

See the report of the Borough Planning Officer – Agenda Item 10 – and the Addendum report.

The Area Planning Manager informed members that the site in question was currently a seven storey building, not in the Conservation Area. The application proposed demolition of the current building and replacement with a twelve storey building consisting of retail on the ground floor and 127 flats above. 38% of the flats would be affordable, but with a separate entrance. There would be a sunken car park with raised amenity space above, plus parking in front of the building for the retail element.

The Addendum report noted 65 additional objections. Objections had been received from residents in Thorney Hedge Road, Silver Crescent and the opposite side of Chiswick High Road. Whilst residents were not against the principle, there was concern about the height, the impact on the surrounding properties, the loss of privacy for these properties and the adverse impact of a building that was out of character with the adjoining Conservation Area.

The report recommended that if an acceptable scheme could be negotiated, the proposal could be recommended to the Sustainable Development Committee for approval, but that if it were not possible to negotiate an acceptable scheme, that the application could be refused under delegated powers. The Chair confirmed that if members were minded to refuse the scheme, officers would do so under delegated powers.

Councillors Davies, Lee and Kinghorn all contributed to the discussion. Members supported the issues raised in the report and raised the following concerns about the application:

- The scheme was over-development
- The housing was very high density.
- This scheme was not what residents wanted for West Chiswick.
- It was inappropriate in an area of Victorian buildings.
- The height would tower over the existing new building and the 2/3 storey houses behind.
The height would block sun to houses immediately to the north.
The design was not aesthetically pleasing.
The view from the High Road would change the present vista.
The Inspector’s comments (at 8.10 of the report) about the height resulting in an oppressive feeling for other residents on the south side, would equally apply in this case on the north side.
The detrimental affect on the quality of life for residents of Thorney Hedge Road.
The height of the scheme would overshadow existing properties, was dominant and out of keeping with the scale of other buildings in the area.
The lack of parking facilities – the proposed parking provision was insufficient. Members suggested there should be one space per flat, including the affordable housing.
There was concern about the different access for affordable housing – This was seen as unfair and socially unacceptable.
It was not acceptable that no flats met wheelchair standards.

Members did not believe that an acceptable scheme could be negotiated and supported recommendation b) of the report, that the application could be refused under delegated powers.

Resolved:
That members did not believe that an acceptable scheme could be negotiated and supported recommendation b) of the report, that the application could be refused under delegated powers.

153. Gable House, 18-28 Turnham Green Terrace

See the report of the Borough Planning Officer – Agenda Item 11- and the Addendum report.

The application related to conversion of offices to flats and the plans included a rear extension and the addition of a fifth floor (sixth storey). This application was bigger than the previous application dismissed by the Inspector on appeal. The Inspector’s concern in relation to the previous application had been that of 16 units, some should be affordable housing. The present application was for 33 units of which 12 would be affordable. There were issues about loss of employment, the proposed affordable housing was not 50% and whilst the windows of the previous design were angled, the windows on this design were 5m closer on the elevation, so there would be over-looking.

One letter of objection had been received so far, but this was a very new application, brought to members in line with the new policy of trying to bring major applications to Committee as soon as possible. The principle of conversion to residential had been established by the Inspector. In respect of density, the London Plan proposed up to 700 habitable rooms per hectare. This was 699.

With regard to the conversion from commercial to residential, Councillor Kinghorn asked whether evidence had been presented that there had been attempts to retain commercial activity. The Area Planning Manager advised that the Inspector had accepted that residential use was an acceptable alternative for the last application, but this had not been tested again for this application. Councillor McGregor also questioned whether there had been any consideration of demolition and rebuild, but this was not part of the present application.
Members made the following comments:

- There had been huge objections to the original proposal from residents in the vicinity.
- Whilst members recognised the need for housing to establish a thriving community, they believed the housing should be desirable and appropriate housing. This was too high density.
- Loss of employment was a key issue.
- The present design would be worse than the previous design in respect of overlooking for the Thornton/Mayfield area.
- In line with the usual policy of the Committee, members did not support the proposal to prohibit residents’ rights to apply for a parking permit.

Councillor McGregor recommended that members reject the application on grounds of density and lack of parking provision. Members agreed that they wished to do so.

Members agreed Recommendation 0.3 of the report, that they would support refusal under delegated powers. In addition members wished to add a comment about access to parking permits.

**Resolved:**

That members support recommendation 0.3 of the report, that if an acceptable scheme cannot be negotiated, then the application can be refused under delegated powers.

**154. Heron House, Chiswick Mall**

See the report of the Borough Planning Officer – Agenda Item 12.

Adam Beamish, Planning Enforcement, explained that the report related to a lift shaft and trellis within the Old Chiswick Conservation Area. An appeal decision had allowed retention of a greenhouse and trellis erected without planning permission only because the trellis was immune. Permission was granted in 1999 for a rear extension and external alterations, including a lift tower intended to access the upper floors but not the roof. The lift tower was built 3m above the height approved and with access to the flat roof. A further section of trellis was erected without planning permission. The materials used in the building of the lift tower also breached the planning condition.

Planning Enforcement had written to the owner in December 2004 and undertaken site visits. The owner had proposed submitting a retrospective application but to date no planning applications had been received and no action taken.

It was felt that the lift and trellis caused harm through failing to enhance the surrounding area and by being prominent and bulky, emphasised by the materials used in contrast with those proposed. In the 2002 appeal decision, the Inspector stated that the greenhouse was harmful to the visual amenity. The development was felt to be out of keeping with the property and the Conservation Area.

Noting comments in the report, Councillor McGregor commented that he did not believe the shaft would have an adverse impact in connection with Chiswick Lane South because of the existing impact of the Brewery. Councillor McGregor also sought to clarify at what stage letters had been sent to the owner and what previous correspondence there had been about the removal of the feature. Mr Beamish clarified that the first letter, requesting action to attend to the issue, had been sent on 3 December 2004. The next letter had been sent prior to the Committee.
Councillor McGregor understood that the owners were aware of the gravity of the circumstances and that the problem had arisen from the lack of the architect overseeing the building. He understood it was the owners’ intention to submit a retrospective planning application as indicated to officers. Mr Beamish advised that he had received the same letter from the owners received by members. He was aware that the owners had had an informal discussion with the Planning Officer but to date no application had been submitted. Roy Pinney, on behalf of the Borough Solicitor, advised members that the report had been brought to them because the shaft departed from the planning permission originally granted.

Councillor Barwood declared that she had visited the site and did believe that it was visible and high. She asked what material it should have been built in, according to the planning condition. Mr Beamish explained that what had been approved was brick shaped hanging tiles, but instead the shaft was white rendered. Similarly, it should have been built 1.1m above the roof but was in fact 3.3m above.

Councillor Kinghorn supported having hanging tiles on the tower. He believed that this could still be done, setting a deadline for completion. The other problem was the height. The tower had not been built to what the plans said but he did not accept it was out of keeping as it had given disabled access to the roof garden. He, therefore, suggested doing something to improve the appearance without changing the height.

In response, Mr Beamish informed members that the Council had not granted planning permission for access to the roof. The owners had taken it upon themselves to create a roof garden.

Councillor McGregor suggested that officers might organise a site visit for members to report back and might give the owners the chance to submit a retrospective application. He understood, in respect of the height of 1.1m that there had been concerns that the plans were not to scale.

The Chair confirmed with Councillor McGregor that he was seeking deferral.

Councillor Lynch expressed a different view. He noted that there were far more breaches of planning permission than were brought to Committee, but that the Committee did receive the worse cases. He did not believe that this breach was one of mistaken measurements, but was deliberate. Enforcement officers had contacted the owners five months ago and in five months there could be efforts to seek retrospective planning permission. Councillor Lynch believed that rather than defer, members should vote to take enforcement action.

In response to a question from Councillor Davies, Mr Beamish confirmed that if members chose to go ahead with enforcement action, it would still be open to the owners to submit a retrospective planning application at any time and that they would also have the right of appeal against the enforcement notice. In reply to Councillor McGregor’s point about the scale, Mr Beamish explained that it was common practice by architects to add ‘do not scale from this plan’ to every plan.

Councillor McGregor proposed deferral of the report for further opportunity to consider the site and for the owner to submit a retrospective planning application. Councillor Kinghorn seconded the motion for deferral. A vote was taken and the motion defeated with three in favour of deferral and five against.

Members, therefore, moved to a vote to take enforcement action, as specified in the report, and in addition to serve a Breach of Condition notice in respect of materials used in the construction of the lift tower. This vote was carried with seven in favour of enforcement and one abstention.
Resolved:
1. That the recommendations of the report for enforcement action be agreed.
2. That a Breach of Condition notice should be served in respect of materials used in the construction of the lift tower.

155. Planning Applications Decided under Officers' Delegated Powers
See the report of the Borough Planning Officer – Agenda Item 13.
Resolved:
That the report be noted.

156. Delegated Decisions: Trees with Tree Preservation Orders (TPOs) or in a Conservation Area
See the report of the Borough Planning Officer – Agenda Item 14.
Councillor Davies noted that the application in respect of a plum tree at 6 Oxford Road North granted removal of the tree but merely recommended that a suitable replacement tree should be planted. She questioned why this did not specify that the tree must be replaced. The Area Planning Manager explained that the tree in question was within a Conservation Area but replacement was only a requirement when the tree was subject to a Tree Preservation Order. Hence replacement could only be recommended in this case.
Resolved:
That the report be noted.

157. Results of Planning Appeals
See the report of the Assistant Chief Executive (Legal) – Agenda Item 15.
The Chair commented that the decision of the Inspector for Item 2, Café Luna was disappointing; given the interest the Committee had taken in applications for change of use. He felt that this decisions was not in keeping with other decisions made in this area.
Councillor Oulds considered that the decision of the Inspector for Item 4, Catos Yard, was a fair decision, recognising that the design was complementary to the area.
Resolved:
That the report be noted.

158. Addendum Report
The report was noted.

159. Chiswick Lodge
The Area Planning Manager advised members as a matter of urgent business that Chiswick Lodge was now empty and was to be marketed.
Members were invited to submit ideas concerning the development of the site to the Area Planning Manager within the next two weeks in order to develop Planning Principles.
Councillor Barwood drew attention to the comments already included in the Health and Social Care Scrutiny Panel’s report and Councillor McGregor commented on the Friends of Chiswick Lodge’s concern to see the provision of care for the elderly. Councillor Lee had heard a rumour that the building might become a West London Centre for Asylum Seekers, which did not appear appropriate use.
Members also asked that the Area Planning Manager take on board the comments of the Old Chiswick Protection Society.

The meeting finished at 10:00 pm.
1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION
1.1 The subject site is located in the north eastern corner of Cleveland Avenue in Chiswick. The site is irregular in shape and contains two maisonettes, number 40 is on the ground floor and number 38 on the first floor. The subject site is at the end of a terrace of maisonettes.

1.2 Number 38 Cleveland Avenue has no garden. The maisonette at number 40 Cleveland Avenue has a small garden to the rear and to the side. The eastern side boundary is shared with the garden of number 36 Cleveland Avenue, a corner house.

1.3 The railway line runs adjacent to the rear boundary for the length of the property. The line runs at or slightly above the height of the first floor of the flat. The view of the railway from ground level is of the embankment.

1.4 The site is not in a conservation area.

2.0 HISTORY
2.1 277/38/P1 Erection of roof extension to dwellinghouse.
   Refused 12 March 1991
   Reason
   Proposed roof extension by reason of its size, position and appearance would appear unduly obtrusive and detrimental to the amenity of adjoining properties and the street scene generally.

2.2 277/38/P2 Erection of roof extension to first floor flat.
   Approved 3 September 1991 – This has not been constructed.

3.0 DETAILS
3.1 Application number 22/38/P1 was refused as it incorporated dormer windows and was a larger scaled development than the current proposal.

3.2 The proposal is for the conversion of the existing attic into a habitable room and bathroom.

3.3 The stairwell extends from the first floor into the proposed second floor loft space. The loft proposes to accommodate a single bedroom and a bathroom. The bedroom has an area of approximately 26.6 square metres and the bathroom has an area of 10.6 square metres.
3.4 The extension is not increasing the envelope of the property in any way. Three roof lights are proposed on the front elevation and three more roof lights are proposed in the rear elevation.

3.5 A new window is proposed in the eastern elevation for the bathroom at second floor level fronting the garden of number 36.

4.0 CONSULTATIONS

4.1 Neighbouring residents at numbers 40, 36, 42 and 33, 35 Cleveland Avenue were notified on 3 March 2005. Seven replies were received, six replies were letters of support for the development and one was to object to the development for the following reasons:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occupancy and Noise increases, therefore loss of amenity. Requests soundproofing between the ground floor and first floor.</td>
<td>The proposal is for rooflights, to enable the roof to be used as a habitable room, which does not affect on the ground floor maisonette.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The application will diminish the water supply to the flat below.</td>
<td>This issue will also be addressed as part of the building consent. This is not a planning concern.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overlooking into garden below.</td>
<td>The proposal incorporates velux roof lights to the front and rear. The angle of the windows, within the plane of the roof, will not provide any opportunity for overlooking. The side window to the bathroom will be obscure glazed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.0 POLICY

5.1 Unitary Development Plan

ENV-B.1.1 All New Development.
H.6.4 Extensions and Alterations

5.2 Supplementary Planning Guidance

Residential Extension Guidelines
Section 5 Roof Extensions, Roof lights & Solar Panels, Roof Terraces & Balconies

6.0 PLANNING ISSUES

6.1 The main planning issues to consider are:

- The impact of the proposal on the amenity of the adjacent neighbours.
- The impact of the proposal on the appearance of the property and the streetscene.

6.2 The impact of the proposal on the amenity of the adjacent neighbours.

6.2.1 It is considered that the proposal will not have a detrimental impact to adjoining neighbours with regard to overlooking, sunlight/daylight or privacy. The rooflights are above eye level of the occupants of the flat and set into the plane of the roof, this will ensure no overlooking can occur.

6.2.2 The proposed window on the second floor eastern elevation is a bathroom window. There is an existing kitchen window on the same elevation on the first floor. A condition of approval would be the requirement of obscure glazing to the proposed bathroom window. This will prevent any opportunity for overlooking into the adjacent garden of number 36.
6.3 The impact of the proposal on the appearance of the property and the streetscene.

6.3.1 There are six roof lights proposed to be inserted on the northern and southern elevations of the pitched roof (three on each side). The rooflights are small in size and a condition of approval will ensure they are inserted to be flush with the existing roof slope. Due to the presence of a gable feature on the front elevation one of the rooflights is partially obscured from the street. The remaining rooflights will have a limited impact on the streetscape. Therefore, due to their small and flush design, it is considered that the rooflights will have minimal impact on the property or the streetscene.

6.3.2 There are currently similar rooflights present within the streetscape. The maisonettes at number 46/48 Cleveland Avenue also have three lights on the street elevation.

7.0 EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES IMPLICATIONS

7.1 There are no equal opportunity implications in this application.

8.0 RECOMMENDATION:

8.1 APPROVE - It is considered that the proposed loft conversion, insertion of six rooflights and construction of one new window, because of the design and appearance, would be acceptable having due regard for the site characteristics of No. 38 Cleveland Avenue and would not be detrimental to the amenities of the adjoining and neighbouring properties. The development is in accordance with the UDP policies ENV-B.1.1 (New Development) and H.6.4 (Alterations and Extensions) of The London Borough of Hounslow UDP, Adopted December 2003; and is compliant with Council’s Residential Extension Guidelines.

8.2 CONDITIONS AND REASONS

CONDITIONS:

(1) A1 The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of five years from the date of this permission.

(2) B5 The development shall be carried out in all respects in accordance with the proposals contained in the application and the plans submitted therewith and approved by the Local Planning Authority, or as shall have been subsequently agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

(3) The rooflights inserted in the front roof elevation shall be flush with the roof slope.

(4) D1 The window formed in the eastern elevation shall be obscure glazed, hinged to open inwards and shall not be repaired or replaced otherwise than with obscured glazing.

REASONS:

(1) To accord with the provisions of Section 92(1) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

(2) To ensure the development is carried out in accordance with the planning permission.

(3) To safeguard the appearance and character of the area.

(4) To prevent overlooking of the nearby premises.
1.0 SUMMARY

1.1 Planning permission was granted on 24th November 2004 to erect a roof extension, which was in accordance with Council guidelines. However, the extension was built larger than approved. This application is for a smaller dormer. If planning permission were to be granted the built dormer could be lawfully reduced to a size that is smaller than the original approved dimensions.

1.2 The report concludes that the proposed amendments to the built rear roof extension comply with Council policy and guidelines and would not have a detrimental impact on the appearance of the dwelling house or the residential estate. It also recommends that an enforcement notice be served on the existing dormer to ensure that it is reduced in size to the size of the approved dormer.

2.0 SITE DESCRIPTION

2.1 The application property is a two-storey mid-terrace house located on the north side of Belmont Terrace within a relatively new residential estate. The estate is located opposite Belmont Junior and Infants School north of Chiswick High Road. It is not within a Conservation Area.

2.2 The application property is one in a row of eight houses. These houses have a street frontage on Belmont Terrace with rear gardens abutting Alfred Close. Alfred Close is a circular development of terraced housing centred around a roundabout, accessed off Belmont Terrace. The houses in Alfred Close look out to the rear of houses along Belmont Terrace.

2.3 Four houses in Alfred Close (numbers 35 to 38) have original twin front roof slope dormer windows. These are small dormer windows with gable roofs; zinc cladding and casement windows. The dormers are well set down below the ridge and set up above the eaves. These dormer windows are visible from the entrance to the estate.

3.0 HISTORY:

3.1 107/8/P1 Erection of roof extension incorporating rooflight to dwelling house, approved 23/11/2004. The dormer was built larger than the approved dimensions.
4.0 DETAILS:

4.1 This application is to reduce the size of the built extension to comply with the approved dimensions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approved dimensions (Ref 107/8/P1)</th>
<th>Width</th>
<th>Height</th>
<th>Depth (along the ridge)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The dormer was set down 0.3m below the ridge; set up 0.9m above the eaves, and set in 1.2m from the party walls.</td>
<td>1.7m</td>
<td>1.9m</td>
<td>3m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The dimensions as built</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The dormer has been set down 0.3m below the ridge; set up 0.9m above the eaves, and set in 1.2m from the party walls.</td>
<td>1.7m</td>
<td>2.5m</td>
<td>3.5m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed reduction (This application)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The dormer is to be set down 0.05m below the ridge; set up 1.3m above the eaves, and set in 1.2m from the party walls.</td>
<td>1.7m</td>
<td>1.9m</td>
<td>2.85m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2 The dormer has a gable roof with white-painted fascia boards and white timber frame windows. The roof of the dormer is clad in slate tiles and the sides are clad in lead roll. The proportions, finish and appearance of the dormer are similar to the original dormers in the estate.

4.3 One velux rooflight (700mm x 600mm) is proposed to the front elevation roof slope facing Belmont Terrace.

5.0 CONSULTATIONS:

5.1 Consultation letters were sent out on the 24th of March 2005 to 4, 6, 8, 10, 12 and 14 Belmont Terrace as well as 33 to 42 Alfred Close to the rear of the application property. The proposed plans were also available for inspection at the local Chiswick library. Four letters of objection were received from residents in Alfred Close.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The dormer overlooks properties in Alfred Close</td>
<td>The dormer is positioned more than 30m away from the front elevation habitable rooms windows of Alfred Close.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The dormer is not built in accordance with approved plans.</td>
<td>Agreed. Planning permission was granted on 23/11/2004 for a rear dormer window and this has been built larger than approved. The height and depth of the dormer is proposed to be reduced to be smaller than the approved scheme (Ref 107/8/P1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The dormer detracts from the character and appearance of the estate</td>
<td>The estate has a uniform character. The height and depth of the built dormer will be reduced to reflect the proportions of the original dormers in the estate. The proposed dormer is similar in shape to the original dormers in the estate with a gable roof; has white- painted fascia boards with square ends; lead clad dormer sides, and slate roof tiles. Two small white painted timber windows will be fitted similar to other original dormers in the estate.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.0 POLICY

6.1 Adopted Unitary Development Plan (December 2003)
- ENV-B.1 New development
- H.6.4 Extensions and alterations
- Appendix 1 Privacy and spacing between buildings

Residential Extension Guidelines (July 2002)
- Section 5 Roof extensions and roof lights

Supplementary Planning Guidance
- Section 9 Form and Design

7.0 PLANNING ISSUES

7.1 Principle of the development and compliance with Council’s policies and guidelines

7.1.1 Planning permission (Ref 107/8/P1) was granted on the 23rd of November 2004 for a small rear dormer window, which is similar in proportion and appearance to the original dormer windows in Alfred Close. This dormer was in accordance with the Residential Extension Guidelines, 2002 and considered acceptable.

7.1.2 According to the Guidelines any roof extension to a terraced house should be set down at least 0.3m (30cm) below the ridge, at least 0.5m (50cm) above the eaves level and at least 0.5m (50cm) from the sides of the roof. The approved dormer conformed to these guidelines in that it would be set down 0.3m below the ridge; set up 0.9m above the eaves, and set in 1.2m from the party walls.

7.1.3 The extension was built larger than what was approved, and located higher up the roof. It has still been mainly built in accordance with Section 5 (Roof Extensions) of the Council’s Residential Extension Guidelines adopted in July 2002. It is set up 1.3m from the eaves and set in 1.2m from the party walls. It is only set down 0.05m down from the ridge, although as the window is a gable it is the ridge line that is just below the main ridge of the roof.

7.1.4 The proposal now is to reduce the size and bulk of the extension by reducing its height from the 2.5m built to the 1.9m approved. Setting it further into the face of the roof would do this. This will reduce the overall height and bulk of the dormer and the resulting dormer would be slightly smaller than the one originally approved. The proposed dormer would still be set in 1.2m from the party walls (which is more than the 0.5m set-in distance prescribed in the Guidelines); and set up 1.3m above the ridge (which is significantly more than the 0.5m set-up distance recommended in the Guidelines). However, the ridge of it will only be set down 0.05m from the ridge of the house.

7.1.5 The original dormers at 33 to 42 Alfred Close to the rear of the application property are set down further below the ridge than the proposed dormer. However, the overall proportions of the proposed dormer are similar to the original ones. Also, the proposed dormer has the same shape and finish as the original dormers. Due to the reductions proposed to the height and depth of the dormer it appears small in relation to the rear roof slope.
7.2 Impact on the appearance of the application property and estate.

7.2.1 The residential estate in which the application property is located is uniform in character and appearance. Planning permission (Ref 107/8/P1) was granted for a small rear dormer window that is similar in proportion shape and appearance to the original ones found in Alfred Close. The dormer was built larger than the approved dimensions. The height of the dormer was built at 2.5m. It is now proposed to reduce this to the 1.9m originally approved. This would be set up 1.3m from the eaves, 0.4m greater than the 0.9m approved. Setting the dormer further into the plane of the roof reduces the height. The depth of the dormer (measured along the ridge) has been reduced from 3.5m (as built) to 2.85m. This application is for planning permission to reduce the dormer to be smaller than the approved dormer. Its positioning within the roof would remain as built.

7.2.2 The proposed dormer is similar in shape proportion and finish to the original dormers in the estate. It has a gable roof with white-painted fascia boards with square ends; lead cladding and a slate roof. Two small white painted timber windows will be fitted to the face of the dormer similar to original dormers in the estate.

7.2.3 The proposed dormer is set down 0.05m below the ridge. The original dormers on the Alfred Close properties in the estate are set down further below the ridge. However, this dormer to 8 Belmont Terrace is to the rear of the house, not to the front as the Alfred Close dormers are. The difference in positioning is not considered to harm the appearance of the house within the estate. This is not a Conservation Area, and the house is some distance from the Alfred Close front dormers, so they are not seen as a group.

7.3 Impact on the amenity of adjacent properties.

7.3.1 The proposed dormer is positioned more than 30m away from the front elevation habitable rooms windows of houses in Alfred Close which is in accordance with the Appendix 1 (Privacy and spacing between buildings) of the Council’s UDP, 2003. Also, all houses in Belmont Terrace have first floor rear elevation bedroom windows facing the rear garden and Alfred Close beyond the rear garden.

7.3.2 The amended scheme shows the dormer to be adequately set in from the sides; above the eaves, and it does not project above the ridge of the roof. The proposed dormer is small in size, and not considered to cause loss of amenity to surrounding properties in terms of loss of light or outlook.

7.4 The Potential for Enforcement Action

7.4.1 The dormer as built represents a breach of planning control that will require resolution in any event. Even if the Council grants planning permission for the present application, the applicant could potentially elect not to implement this permission.

7.4.2 The imposition of a condition requiring the carrying out of development within a particular time period would be at odds with Circular 11/95. In this situation, it is desirable for the Council to issue a planning enforcement notice requiring the removal of the offending dormer within a specific time period, whether or not Members decide to grant planning permission for a dormer that has been reduced to that originally approved.

7.4.3 If Members decided that permission should be granted, then under Section 180(3) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 the enforcement notice would need to be complied with save to the extent of the works which had received a specific grant of planning consent.
7.4.4 Alternatively, if Members decided to refuse permission altogether, then an enforcement notice would be necessary to secure the removal of parts of the dormer to enable the approved dormer to be built. The reasons for expediency for such enforcement action are the adverse effect of the dormer in terms of its size and failure to blend in with, and reflect the character and appearance of, the residential estate, and which resulted in the loss of visual amenity for surrounding residents, contrary to policies ENV-B.1.1 (New development) and H.6.4 (Extensions and Alterations) of the Council’s UDP, 2003.

7.4.5 While such an enforcement notice would be subject to potential appeal, the effect of not issuing a notice would be to leave open the possibility for the applicant to retain the dormer as built.

8.0 RECOMMENDATION ‘A’

8.1 APPROVE subject to the following reason and conditions:

Reasons:

1. The reductions proposed to the height and depth of the built rear dormer is considered to reflect the approved drawings of Planning Application Ref 107/8/P1. The result is a small dormer that is proportional to the original roof extensions in the estate and well within dimensions requirements set out in Section 5 (Roof Extensions) of the Council’s Residential Extension Guidelines that were adopted in July 2002.

2. The dormer by reason of position; size; finish and appearance is considered to comply with policy ENV-B.1.1 (New Development) and H.6.4 (Residential Extensions) of Council Unitary Development Plan, 2003, and Section 9 (Form and Design) of Council’s SPG, 1997.

8.2 CONDITIONS

Condition
The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building and residential estate.

Reason
In order to safeguard the visual amenity of the area and building in particular)

Condition
The proposed development shall be carried out in all respects in accordance with the proposals contained in the application and the plans submitted therewith and approved by the Local Planning Authority, or as shall have been otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority (before the building is used).

Reason
To ensure the development is carried out in accordance with the planning permission

Condition
A Conservation Area type roof light, which is flush fitting with the existing roof tiles, shall be fitted to the front elevation roof slope at the positions herewith approved.

Reason
To safeguard the appearance and character of the residential estate.
9.0 RECOMMENDATION ‘B’

That the Committee grants authority, having regard to policies within the Unitary Development Plan, 2003 and all relevant material considerations, for all necessary steps to be taken for the preparation, issue and service of an enforcement notice requiring within three months the partial demolition of the dormer not in accordance with this planning permission and the removal from the site of all resulting materials pursuant to Section 172 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990; and the institution of any necessary legal proceedings in the event of non-compliance with this notice pursuant to Section 179 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. If necessary, the carrying out of works in default under Section 178 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.
0.0 SUMMARY

0.1 The proposal is to demolish the existing building and replace it with a building of the same height and massing. This building would be purpose built as 16 flats, with communal amenity area to the rear and an area fenced off to the front to give some privacy to the ground floor flats and provide an area for refuse and recycling storage off-street.

0.2 The upper floors have previously been used as flats. The principle of residential accommodation in this location is considered to be in accordance with London Plan and Unitary Development Plan policy.

0.3 Member’s comments are sought on the scale of development, the density, the amenity space and parking provision and suggested obligations under s106.

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION

1.1 0.067ha site to the west of Chiswick Town Centre, on the southern side of Chiswick High Road (0.79ha for density purposes). Nos 331-335 form part of a part three / part four storey terrace, between No 329 and No 337 Chiswick High Road. To the east of this terrace is Kings Place, a small road that gives access to the rear of the Job Centre at 319-327 Chiswick High Road, and to the 11 x 2-storey residential dwellings of Bishops Close to the rear. Adjoining to the west is a 3 ½ storey terrace of residential properties, some of which have been converted to flats. To the west of that is a 5-storey office building. Opposite the terrace is a two-storey car showroom on the corner of Chiswick High Road and Chiswick Road.
1.2 The town centre boundary falls through the middle of the site, and the area of 281-333 Chiswick High Road is designated a shopping parade (outside of the primary and secondary shopping parades) in the Unitary Development Plan.

1.3 331-335 is currently vacant, but was most recently used as a timber shop and yard on the ground floor and to the rear. The upper floors are also vacant at present, but have been used for residential in the past.

1.4 The existing building on site is three-storey, with a basement. The adjoining residential block to the west is 3 ½ storey, with basements, and the building to the east on the corner of Kings Place is three storey, with a 2-storey rear extension. It consists of a coffee shop on the ground floor and offices above. The two storey rear extension comprises a number of small workshop / business units fronting Kings Place. No windows overlook No 331.

1.5 The street frontage is partly owned by the applicant and partly owned by LB Hounslow. It is all designated public highway. The timber lorries for the timber yard used to park on the public footpath, and now that the use has ceased, a number of vehicles are crossing the public footpath to park in front of the vacant building.

1.6 The site falls within the West Chiswick CPZ. Chiswick High Road in front of the site falls within the Chiswick Inner Core and has shoppers parking in some places. In front of the site is a cycle lane, and a pelican crossing is proposed as part of the Chiswick High Road bus priority scheme.

2.0 HISTORY

2.1 There is no planning history for the application site. It would appear to have been in use as a timber yard with various uses (including residential) above since 1911, from building records.

3.0 DETAILS

3.1 It is proposed to demolish the existing mid–terrace building, and replace it with a block of 16 flats.

3.2 The frontage onto Chiswick High Road will be four-storey. The height fronting Chiswick High Road would be 26m, the same height as the existing building.

3.3 The main part of the building next to No 329 would be 14m in depth. A bay window to the front flat extends this to 14.5m depth for the area of the bays. On the boundary with No 337, the depth of the building would be 10m, with a 1m deep bay window is proposed. The main fronting building line will line up with the front of the existing building for a width of 6m, and then it will project forwards by 1.5m. At the rear, the building would extend 1.5m beyond No 337 on the boundary. As at the front, there is a further 3m deep extension set in 6m from the side boundary with No 337.

3.4 The ground floor will have 4 x 1-bed flats. The first, second and third floors all have 2 x 2-bed and 2 x 1-bed flats on each floor. Overall, that is 10 x 1-bed and 6 x 2-bed flats.

3.5 One of the ground floor flats at the rear will be adapted for use by people in wheelchairs. This will have French windows opening onto the amenity area, with ramped access.

3.6 The living rooms on the ground and first floors at the front have bay windows. On the second and third floors, these are balconies. Juliet balconies are proposed to the living rooms on the 1st, 2nd and 3rd floor flats at the rear. The ground floor flats have French windows opening directly onto the communal amenity area, and landscaping around this will create a privacy screen. Over 330m2 communal amenity area is proposed at the rear of the building, accessible to all flats.
3.7 It is proposed to enclose an area of public highway to the front of the site. This would be to a depth of 5.5m, 1.5m less than the depth of the front garden at No 337 Chiswick High Road adjoining. Refuse and recycling enclosures would be contained within this area, which would be enclosed by a wall with railings.

3.8 No on-site parking is proposed.

4.0 CONSULTATIONS

4.1 Over 50 neighbouring residents were notified on 14th April 2005. Press and site notices were also posted. 2 replies have been received, commenting as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A four storey development would be out of character with the existing streetscape</td>
<td>The overall height of the building would remain the same as existing. An additional storey can be created for residential because of lower floor to ceiling heights.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of light</td>
<td>The site is 30m to the north of residential of Bishops Close, thus unlikely to affect sunlight to these properties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of privacy</td>
<td>The upper floors have already been in residential use. They adjoin properties of the same mass that are also in residential use. There is separation of over 30m between habitable rooms of Bishops Close and the proposed flats.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The area is already very congested for parking</td>
<td>It is proposed that the future occupiers of the development be excluded from the West Chiswick CPZ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2 Director of LLLCS comments that, should approval be considered, a financial contribution of £9000 would be sought towards a secondary school place

5.0 POLICY

5.1 London Plan

Policy 2A.1 Sustainability criteria  
Policy 2A.5 Town centres  
Policy 3A.1 Increasing London’s supply of housing  
Policy 3A.2 Borough Housing targets  
Policy 3A.4 Housing Choice  
Policy 3D.1 Supporting town centres  
Policy 3D.2 Town centre development  
Policy 4B.3 Maximising the potential of sites  
Table 4B.1 Density location and parking matrix
5.2 **Unitary Development Plan**

- ENV-B 1.1 All New Development
- ENV-B 1.8 Access and Facilities for People with Disabilities
- ENV-B 1.9 Safety and Security
- E 1.5 Loss of Employment
- E 1.3 Location of General Industry and Storage and Distribution Uses
- H 1.1 Location of New Housing Development
- H 2.1 Affordable Housing
- H 4.1 Housing Standards and Guidelines
- H 4.2 Residential density
- H 4.4 Provision for Children’s Play in Housing Development
- S 1.4 Non Retail Uses
- T 1.1 Location of Development
- T 1.4 Car and Cycle Parking and Servicing Facilities for Developments
- T.4.6 Off Street Parking
- IMP 2.4 Enhancement of Chiswick Town Centre
- IMP 6.1 Planning Obligations

6.0 **PLANNING ISSUES**

6.1 The main issues in the determination of this application are:

- the principle of residential on the site,
- the loss of retail/employment
- Bulk, scale and massing and the appearance in the area
- Quality of the proposed accommodation
- Impact on adjoining residents and the area as a whole
- Traffic, parking and access

**Principle of residential**

6.2 The site is located on the boundary with Chiswick Town Centre, with half the site being in the town centre, and half the site outside. Policy IMP.2.4 aims to maintain and improve Chiswick town centre whilst ensuring that vitality and viability of the retail component is not detrimentally affected. The site was used as a timber yard, with shop/office/workshop for about 90 years. The use has recently ceased. The upper floors have been used as flats, offices, mini cab offices and other ancillary uses throughout this time and are now also vacant.

6.3 PPG 3 (Housing), The London Plan and the Council’s Unitary Development Plan both encourage more efficient use of the land in order to provide sustainable communities and meet housing needs in the local area. Particularly, PPG3 states that more intensive housing developments are encouraged in Town Centre Locations where public transport and other facilities are located. The application site is in accordance with these policies as it is well located in terms of access to public transport and other facilities, is a brownfield site and is located within Chiswick Town Centre.

6.4 Similarly, The London Plan and Policy E.1.5 of the Unitary Development Plan encourages the redevelopment of sites for residential purposes on unneeded potential employment land. The site is not designated as an employment site. Housing is an appropriate alternative use in this location as it is compatible with the surrounding residential use to the west, is close to public transport facilities and community, health, education, leisure and retail services. This site has always been in mixed employment and residential use.
6.5 Policy H 1.1 of the Unitary Development Plan states that new housing should be located in accordance with the Council’s framework for sustainable development and regeneration. When considering new housing proposals, the Council will seek to promote sustainable patterns of development and allow for new housing provided it is consistent with all other policies in the Unitary Development Plan, and can be achieved within a high quality environment for new and existing residents.

**Loss of retail/employment**

6.6 A traditional timber yard, as was found on this site, is not considered to be a traditional type of retail use within Class A found in a town centre, as it did not have a shopfront, with items available for sale to visiting members of the public. Loss of the timber yard in this location is not considered to affect the retail viability of Chiswick Town Centre.

6.7 It would fall to be considered under Policy E 1.5 Loss of Employment Use of the Unitary Development Plan, which states that housing may be considered to be an acceptable alternative to employment where the existing employment use is detrimental to the surrounding area and fails to meet the criteria of policy E 2.1. Bishops Close to the rear is a gated residential development. There is no rear servicing to the site. The only servicing and loading would be from Chiswick High Road. The site adjoins housing to the west and south. Housing is considered to be a more appropriate use of the site in this location.

6.8 16 flats are proposed, for private sale. The threshold for seeking affordable housing would be 20 units. To achieve 20 units on the site, the bulk and massing would have to increase, and this would be unacceptable in streetscape and density terms. The proposal for 16 private flats is thus considered to be acceptable on this site.

**Bulk, scale and massing and the appearance in the area**

6.7 The proposal is for a building to replace the existing building, at the same height and similar depth to the existing building. The proposed building would have four floors of flats. The existing building has 3 floors, plus part basement. The proposed building would reach the same height as the existing building – the additional floor would be created by reducing internal floor to ceiling heights.

6.8 The site is not located in a Conservation Area, but is close to Turnham Green Conservation Area to the south and east of the site. The proposed design and appearance is considered to be appropriate to ensure that it relates to the heights of the existing and surrounding buildings and works within the existing streetscene. The proposed appearance will provide an interesting building following the existing forms within the context of the area.

6.9 The proposal of 6 two-bed flats and 10 one-bed flats equates to a density of 480 habitable rooms per hectare (hrpha). Council’s policy H 4.2 states that new developments should not exceed 250 hrpha except in locations where it is within a town centre location with good public transport accessibility. PPG 3 and the London Plan both encourage more efficient use of land in order to provide sustainable communities and to meet local housing needs. Specifically, table 4B.1 of the London Plan sets appropriate densities to be achieved. For sites such as the application site where it is within a town centre location and close to public transport facilities, proposals for predominately flat developments should be a density of 450-700 hrpha, ensuring it is compatible with local context.
6.10 As this site is located in a town centre and is close to public transport links, the density of 480 hrpha is acceptable in this location, taking into account the surrounding context. It is greater than the maximum density outlined in the Unitary Development Plan, but the provision of on-site amenity space and the location near to buses and an underground station is considered to make the higher density acceptable on this site. Overall, the proposal is considered to comply with Policy H.4.2 of the Unitary Development Plan, PPG3 and the London Plan guidance.

**Quality of the proposed accommodation**

6.11 Council’s Supplementary Planning Guidance for amenity space sets minimum standards for suitable and usable provision. In accordance with this Guidance, each flat would generate a requirement 25sq.m, creating a total amenity space requirement of 400sq.m. The proposal is for a communal rear garden area of 330m². In addition, the 2nd and 3rd floor flats fronting Chiswick High Road would have private balconies.

6.12 The provision of amenity space falls 70m² short of the Council’s requirement. However, given the constraints of the existing site it is difficult to provide any further amenity space on site. Given these constraints, the provision of balconies to four upper floor flats and the fact that Turnham Green is within a 5 minute walk of the site, it is considered appropriate that off-site contributions to improvements to nearby public amenity space are made to offset this shortfall.

6.13 The Council’s Supplementary Guidance on Housing Standards sets minimum standards to be achieved for the internal space provision of flats. The proposed development satisfactorily provides sufficiently sized kitchen, living, bathroom and sleeping areas. Given that a communal rear garden area is provided, the standard of living for future residents would be acceptable.

6.14 One of the flats on the ground floor would be made accessible for people in wheelchairs.

**Impact on adjoining residents and the area as a whole**

6.15 The building is attached to 337 Chiswick High Road. This building has been converted to flats. The sole use of the application site as flats is not considered to affect the adjoining properties. Issues such as the practicalities of demolition and rebuilding are covered under Building Regulations.

6.16 The height of the building proposed is considered to be appropriate to the surroundings. It is to the north of Bishops Close and will have no impact on this development from loss of light or overshadowing. Because of the distances and orientation of other residential properties from the site, it is not considered that the proposal would result in any loss of light or overshadowing.

6.17 The building would be 1.5m deeper than the main rear building line of No 337. The windows to the flats within No 337 are set in 70cm from the boundary. Because of the separation, it is not considered that the set back of 1.5m depth will result in a material loss of light to the flats in 337. The building extends a further 3m in depth, set-in 6m from the boundary with 337. Because of the stagger in the building line and the set-in, this is not considered likely to result in a loss of light to the existing property at 337. No 329 is a 3-storey corner building with a 2 storey rear extension for the whole depth of the site. The proposed building would be 1m higher than the parapets of 329, and would extend 6m to the rear of the three storey element. There is one window in the rear of the upper floor of this building and it is used as offices.
6.18 With regards to privacy, the distance of 21m between habitable room windows (of the proposed flats and Bishops Close) as recommended in SPG is maintained. The upper floors have already been used as flats, so no further overlooking between upper floor flats of communal garden areas is expected. No 337 is already used as flats, so their amenity space is communal.

6.19 The proposed enclosure of an area to the front of the building at ground floor level would also protect the privacy of future occupiers of the ground floor flats, and prevent loss of privacy from the public view.

6.20 The appearance would be an improvement in the streetscape of Chiswick High Road, and it would complement the existing residential development. At the rear, care has been taken to design the elevations to retain the existing features of the terrace.

Traffic, parking and access

6.21 The Council’s Unitary Development Plan states that this type of development generates a maximum requirement of 16 car parking spaces plus 10% visitor spaces. The proposal has no off-street car parking. The development of Bishops Close to the rear is gated. The surrounding streets to the south are covered by West Chiswick Controlled Parking Zone, and the north and west by the Chiswick inner core with shoppers parking. Chiswick High Road in front of the site has double yellow lines to prevent parking. The site is well located in terms of public transport with Chiswick Park Underground Tube Station a 5-minute walk away and a number of buses along Chiswick High Road in front of the site. A car free development is considered appropriate in this location, due to the proximity to a variety of modes of public transport, and the town centre location. The surrounding Controlled Parking Zone is under pressure from existing permit holders, and the area to the north and east of the site is for shoppers parking. It is considered important in this case to ensure that future residents do not obtain parking permits. If planning permission is given, a legal agreement preventing future occupiers obtaining car parking permits for themselves or their guests is recommended.

6.22 At present, the area in front of the premises is paved, and forms part of the public highway. Vehicles parked on it when the timber yard was in operation, and the number of vehicles using it illegally for parking has increased since the use as a timber yard has ceased. Part of this is in the ownership of the Local Authority and part is in the ownership of the applicants. In the interests of creating a well balanced development, it is considered that a land swap would be beneficial to both parties in this instance. A fenced area to the front would improve the streetscape, provide privacy for the occupiers of the ground floor flats, and provide an area for the storage of refuse and recycling receptacles.

6.23 Fencing this area would require that the public highway be stopped up in this location. The public highway is 9m wide in front of the site. Enclosing an area 5m deep would still leave a footpath of width 4m, which is considered to be acceptable. It allows plenty of room for people to pass (the minimum required depth is 1.8m), and leaves a wide area around the street tree. The footpath in front of 337 Chiswick High Road is 3m in depth.

6.24 The intensity of use of this site would increase, as more people would be present in the area. The applicants have agreed to pay a sum of £30 000 towards environmental improvements in the area, including improvements to the footway, streetlighting and pedestrian safety on this busy pedestrian route on Chiswick High Road.
7.0 EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES IMPLICATIONS
7.1 One ground floor flat will be provided to wheelchair standards.

8.0 CONCLUSION
8.1 The scheme accords with sustainability principles, providing residential development on urban land close to public transport facilities and employment, retail and services of the town centre. Redevelopment of this area would improve the visual appearance of the site, whilst encouraging more efficient use of the land. The proposal is considered to achieve a high quality development that complies with Council policies while maintaining the living conditions of the nearby residents.

9.0 PLANNING OBLIGATIONS
9.1 Policy IMP 6.1 seeks to ensure that a developer enters into a planning obligation to secure planning benefits related to the proposed development where appropriate. Developments proposing ten dwellings or more would be likely to increase the demand for educational facilities within the Borough, especially given that this proposed development provides eight two-bed units. There is a deficiency of on-site amenity space proposed on site, so it is proposed to offset this with a financial contribution towards improvements to local open space in the vicinity of the site.

9.2 Measures directly related to the development
   Education-A financial contribution towards a secondary school place
   Environmental Improvements – A financial contribution towards the carrying out of appropriate improvements to the pedestrian environment, including streetlighting and pedestrian safety measures, within the vicinity of the site.
   Amenity space – a financial contribution towards enhancing nearby public amenity space
   Agreement that the development should be car free.
1.0 Summary
1.1 Chiswick Lodge has been used as hospital since 1912, when it was endowed to local people by Dan Mason. As this site was in use as a hospital, it is not included in the Unitary Development Plan as a proposals site.

1.2 In March 2005 planning officers were notified that the site was to be disposed of in July 2005. The site was to be marketed in May 2005, with an advert being placed in Estates Gazette.

1.3 Draft planning guidelines to guide developers as to the type of development that may be acceptable on the site were prepared by the agents disposing of the site.

1.4 The planning guidelines have been amended by planning officers to incorporate more design and layout advice, and these are attached as Planning Principles for development on the site. These have been submitted to Old Chiswick Protection Society and Chiswick Lodge Action Group for their comments. Neither group has any objections to the Planning Principles.

1.5 Because of the short notice officers were given of the timescale to market and dispose of the site, there has not been time to formulate a planning brief for the site, with full public consultation, and adopt it as Supplementary Planning Guidance.

1.6 The purpose of this report is to advise members of the content of the planning principles to be distributed to developers for this site, and to seek any further comments they may have. The planning principles will have no statutory basis as planning guidance, as there has been no opportunity for public consultation, but will offer developers some comfort on the agreed principles for development of the site.

1.7 It is expected that a planning application will follow shortly after the site is disposed, and as part of such an application there will be full public consultation undertaken.

2.0 RECOMMENDATIONS
2.1 That Members note the contents and agree the planning principles.
Planning Principles

May 2005

1.0 Introduction
1.1 These Planning Principles have been prepared as a guide for prospective purchasers of Chiswick Lodge. They have been prepared in consultation with officers of the London Borough of Hounslow Planning Department. The Vendors selling agents and planning consultants will be pleased to provide further advice on the contents of this document.

1.2 The site is currently owned by Hounslow Primary Care Trust and has, following a consultation exercise, been declared surplus to the requirements of the NHS. Services have been re-provided elsewhere within the Borough, and in accordance with national guidance to the NHS, the site is to be marketed and these guidelines seek to establish the planning parameters for its future use.

2.0 Site and Surroundings

2.1 Chiswick Lodge is located between the Great West Road (A4) and the River Thames with frontages to both Chiswick Mall to the south, directly looking over the Thames and Netheravon Road South to the north. Private residential dwellings bound the site to the east and west.

2.2 The site falls within Old Chiswick Conservation Area. The main setting of this part of the Conservation Area is listed buildings and long gardens. Along Chiswick Mall, eleven properties consecutively to the west, and five consecutively to the east are listed buildings. The only ones that are not listed in this complete run are Chiswick Lodge itself and its formerly associated plot “The Cottage”.

2.3 All except two are listed Grade II. Walpole House is Grade I, and was the premier property of the area, most of the immediate neighbourhood having been part of its land. Stretches of the rear wall along Netheravon Road are part of this historical heritage. Strawberry House, next but one to the site, is listed at Grade II*. The gardens of both these properties are on English Heritage’s Register of Historic Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest.

2.4 Historically the gardens of these properties backed onto Netheravon Road, which provided access and ancillary buildings for use of the river-fronting houses. Further west, some of these have been subdivided from the major plots and have become separate curtilages. Even so, most of these have been designed to present the character of being mews or overgrown (but ancillary) coach-house buildings on the boundary, with garaging at ground floor. This has the value of ensuring a substantial area of open garden between the Mall-side buildings and those perching at the boundary with Netheravon Road.

2.5 A site location plan is attached as Appendix 1.

2.6 The site is L-shaped, as a separate plot on the Chiswick Mall frontage has been previously sold for the development of a private residence.
2.7 The frontage onto Chiswick Mall is approximately 26.9m (100 ft) and to Netheravon Road South approximately 36.9m (135 ft). The site is understood to extend to approximately 0.23 hectares (0.568 acres).

2.8 There is an existing vehicle access off Netheravon Road South and pedestrian access from Chiswick Mall.

2.9 The existing building extends to a total floor area of approximately 2502 sq m (26,930 sq ft) on a gross internal area basis. The majority of the rear of the building was constructed in the 1930's.

2.10 The southern façade to Chiswick Mall is a three-storey neo Georgian design of brick under a pitched roof with timber sash windows with a small garden area fronting onto Chiswick Mall. It is at a higher level than the road. Pevsner describes the building, overlooking the river, as the former Chiswick Maternity Hospital; 1912. It has been designed to "read" as a single, symmetrical large residence overlooking a semi-formal forecourt garden. The building has a traditionally classical hierarchy of windows in the centre bay, and with the sliding sash windows and appropriately coloured brickwork is plain and dominating but not un-neighbourly by virtue of the setback and softening of the planting in the foreground. The space is borrowed for overlooking by the side elevations of The Oziers, in particular, and St John’s, and has thus become an important feature in the street scene.

2.11 In the middle of the site the property provides ancillary offices at ground level and a conservatory with ward areas on the two floors above. At the northern end of the site there is a large three-storey block with brick elevations and a pitched roof. It is considered that this later element of the building does not benefit from the same standard of architectural design as the southern elevation.

2.12 Internally the building is functional, with small ward areas, individual rooms and associated offices. Floors and walls are mainly of solid construction and the resulting configuration is rather cellular. Internal ceiling heights are approximately 3m (10ft) reflecting the purpose of the building as a hospital.

2.13 The site also includes an outbuilding for plant and parking/delivery areas. In the centre of the site abutting the western boundary there is a small area of garden.

3.0 Planning Policy Context

National and Strategic Planning Policies

3.1 The relevant Planning Policy Guidance (PPG) is as follows:
3.2 The Key policies of the London Plan: Spatial Development Strategy for Greater London (February 2004) are listed below:

3A.1 Increasing London’s supply of housing
3A.4 Housing choice
3A.17 Health objectives
4C.10 Historic Environment
4C.11 Conservation Areas

Unitary Development Plan (UDP)

3.3 These guidelines should be read in conjunction with the provisions of the Hounslow Unitary Development Plan (Adopted December 2003). Chiswick Lodge is not identified within the UDP proposals schedule, but lies within the Old Chiswick Conservation Area and the Thames Policy Area.

Regard should be made to the following policies:

Implementation Policies

IMP.1.2 The reuse and recycling of urban land and buildings
IMP.5.1 High quality building and urban design
IMP.6.1 Planning Obligations

Built and Natural Environment

ENV-B.1.1 New Development
ENV-B.1.8 Access and facilities for people with disabilities
ENV-B.1.9 Safety and security
ENV-B.2.2 Conservation Areas
ENV-B 3.2 Sites of Archaeological Importance
ENV-N.2.7 Trees and Community Woodlands
ENV-P.1.1 Environmental Sustainability: Environmental Impact Statements and Sustainability Checklist
ENV-W.1.1 Design in the Thames Policy Area
ENV-W.1.3 Important Views and Structures in the Thames Policy Area
ENV-W1.4 Archaeology of the Thames Policy Area

Housing

H.1.1 The location of new housing development
H.2.1 Affordable Housing
H.4.1 Housing standards and guidelines
H.4.2  Residential density  
H.4.3  Residential mix  
H.5.1  Housing for people with disabilities  
H.7.1  Supported housing  

Community  
C.3.3  Changes of Use of Health Facilities  

Transport  
T.1.2  The movement implications of development  
T.1.4  Car and cycle parking and servicing facilities for developments  
T.2.2  Pedestrian safety and security  
T.4.3  Traffic implications of new developments  
T.4.4  Road safety  

Supplementary Planning Guidance  

3.4. The relevant Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) includes:

Think Access – Design for accessibility (London Borough Hounslow April 2000)  
Residential Standards and Controls (LBH February 1997)  

4.0 Potential Uses  

4.1 The site was most recently used as a hospital for elderly and mentally ill patients, and the building is designed as assisted bedrooms, communal washrooms, communal dayrooms and supporting offices. The Primary Care Trust has relocated the patients and declared the premises surplus to requirements.  

4.2 Policy C 3.3 of the Unitary Development Plan states that “the loss of buildings for health use will not normally be permitted unless it can be demonstrated that all relevant local and area needs can be satisfactorily met. On sites and buildings which are surplus to the health authority requirements, any future use should be consistent with the character of the locality. The Local Planning Authority will endeavour to see that developments make the maximum contribution to unmet needs for health care in the borough”.  

4.3 The preferred use in accordance with adopted local plan policy would be a continuation of a health use on the site. A nursing home use or other uses falling within the Use Class C 2 would be acceptable in principle. If an alternative use was to be proposed, it would need to established that all relevant local and area health needs can be met.  

4.4 If that can be demonstrated, then an acceptable alternative use for the land would be residential.
5.0 Density and Affordable Housing

5.1 Policy H 4.2 of the Unitary Development Plan states that density in new development should take account of the density of surrounding areas and should not normally be less than 150 hrpha, or more than 250 hrpha. In this location, considering the accessibility of the site, the existing built form and character of the surrounding areas, density would be expected to be towards the lower end of the scale.

5.2 All housing developments in the Borough capable of providing 20 or more dwellings, and/or residential sites of 0.75 ha or more (irrespective of the number of dwellings) should make provision for on site affordable housing.

6.0 Design and Conservation Issues

6.1 Chiswick Lodge lies within the Old Chiswick Conservation Area, with a frontage to the River Thames. Any redevelopment, in line with national and local planning policy must accord with the character and townscape of the Conservation Area. The views into the area from the river are given specific policy protection and therefore the southern façade, facing the Thames, is of particular importance.

6.2 Retention of the building fronting Chiswick Mall is strongly recommended. Vertical subdivision into smaller dwelling units with rear garden space would be an acceptable form of conversion of the existing buildings. There are windows in all facades, which allow views to all sides. Any redevelopment will have ensure that there is no loss of privacy, daylight/sunlight, overlooking and noise and disturbance in accordance with UDP policy ENV-B.1.1

6.3 The scale and mass of the main existing buildings behind the river frontage, dating mainly from the 1930s, should not be considered appropriate precedent for redevelopment: in relation to domination or overlooking of the adjacent gardens, nor the continuity of the building from front to back. Ideally the site would be returned to house and garden. Since the subject site had been developed before, the coach-house / shared amenity courtyard or garden, of small fragmented blocks with a permeable link for pedestrians through to the riverside, could be a successful design theme.

6.4 Given the height and scale of the existing buildings on the site and the townscape of the surrounding Conservation Area, it is anticipated that a development rising to two and three storeys is likely to be acceptable on the site. Townhouses on top of ground floor garaging is a style of development already successfully established along the Netheravon Road frontage.

6.5 Retention of the whole building and conversion to flats would not be considered favourably. The building was designed as a hospital, for
people to stay for limited periods of time. Conversion to private flats that would form permanent residential accommodation would result in overlooking of the adjacent properties on Chiswick Mall from side windows.

6.6 There are a few trees on the boundaries of the site and these are protected by virtue of the Conservation Area designation. The Council will require all existing trees of amenity and landscape value to be assessed, and a tree survey submitted with any application. The general premise is that trees should be retained or replacements planted where appropriate.

6.7 The site being opposite to the entry of Netheravon Road from the Great West Road should present a high quality appearance to the approach to this extremely important conservation area.

7.0 Housing Standards and Layout

7.1 The design and layout should meet the standards for private/communal amenity space, privacy and parking. 50m² private amenity space should be provided for houses with 3 habitable rooms, 60m² for houses with four habitable rooms and 75m² for houses with 5 and above habitable rooms. For flats, 25m² communal amenity space is sought for units with 3 habitable rooms, 30m² for units with 4 habitable rooms and 40m² for units with 5 habitable rooms and above.

7.2 21m distance should be retained between habitable rooms to preserve privacy. Existing side windows should be obscure glazed and used as non-habitable rooms.

8.0 Traffic and Parking

8.1 Parking standards for residential development are 1.1 for 1 and 2 bed dwellings, and 2 spaces for 3 bed + dwellings. Parking standards are a maximum. However, part of the reason for the layout of Chiswick Mall in its existing form of residential on the Mall frontage and rear access / ancillary buildings fronting Netheravon Road, is that Chiswick Mall floods at regular intervals. Cars cannot be permanently parked there. A residential parking scheme is in place in the area. The on-street spaces are already under pressure at times of high tide, and substantial additional pressure would be resisted. Off-street parking should be provided in an appropriate design and layout within the Conservation Area, and pedestrian permeability maintained throughout the site.

9.0 Planning Obligations

9.1 The Council will seek to ensure by planning agreement as necessary, appropriate benefits in connection with the development in accordance with national and the UDP policies. These are likely to include a requirement for the delivery of 50% affordable housing on site for schemes of 20 dwellings or more, a financial contribution towards
education, a financial contribution towards environmental improvements to the area, including riverside improvements, and a financial contribution towards improving pedestrian links to public transport facilities.

10.0 Additional Information

10.1 The Local Planning Authority welcome the opportunity to participate in pre-application discussions with the future purchaser of the site prior to submission of an application on this site.

10.2 A flood risk assessment should be submitted with any planning application.

10.3 The site is within an archaeological priority area. Future applicants should work with English Heritage to assess the archaeological implications of any future development of the site.

11.0 Contacts

London Borough of Hounslow:

Marilyn Smith MA MRTPI          Borough Planning Office
Area Planning Manager          London Borough of Hounslow
Telephone:  020 8583 4994        The Civic Centre
Fax:           020 8583 4900        Lampton Road
Email: marilyn.smith@hounslow.gov.uk Hounslow
                                      TW3 4DN
## CHISWICK AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE

### 25 May 2005

## DELEGATED DECISIONS

Report by: Borough Planning Officer

### Summary

List of delegated decisions taken between 19 Mar 2005 – 9 May 2005

### RECOMMENDATION

That Members Note The Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Item 10</th>
<th>Decision Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>00261/A/P26 Texaco Hogarth Filling Station Mawson Lane, Chiswick, W4 2QD</td>
<td>WITHDRAWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00499/65/P3 65 Grantham Road, Chiswick, W4 2RT</td>
<td>FULL PLANNING PERMISSION REFUSED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00248/64/P10 64 Chiswick High Road, Chiswick, W4 1SY</td>
<td>FULL PLANNING PERMISSION REFUSED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00412/44/P3 44 Ennismore Avenue, Chiswick, W4 1SF</td>
<td>FULL PLANNING PERMISSION REFUSED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00248/144/P11 144 Chiswick High Road, Chiswick, W4 1PU</td>
<td>FULL PLANNING PERMISSION REFUSED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00969/5/P5 5 Rupert Road, Chiswick, W4 1LU</td>
<td>FULL PLANNING PERMISSION REFUSED</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Chiswick Homefields**
  - P/2005/0495 Texaco Hogarth Filling Station Mawson Lane, Chiswick, W4 2QD
    - Change of use from petrol filling station to ancillary brewery use including erection of new boundary fence to brewery and amended access onto the A4 for brewery vehicles.
  - P/2005/0446 65 Grantham Road, Chiswick, W4 2RT
    - Erection of single storey rear extension, and erection of new decking to rear incorporating steps and installation of access doors to floor void to existing house.
  - P/2005/0463 64 Chiswick High Road, Chiswick, W4 1SY
    - Erection of three storey over the existing ground floor flat to create two x two bedroom self-contained flat and one x one bedroom self-contained flat.
  - P/2005/0469 44 Ennismore Avenue, Chiswick, W4 1SF
    - Dividing single house into one - 5 bedroom house and one - three bedroom house with parking and erection of three storey staircase to create an access to 44A Ennismore Avenue.
  - P/2005/0666 144 Chiswick High Road, Chiswick, W4 1PU
    - Erection of basement and ground floor pitched roof rear extension to restaurant with spiral staircase to existing first floor flat incorporating new railing.
  - P/2005/0497 5 Rupert Road, Chiswick, W4 1LU
    - Erection of single storey rear extension with rooflight over to house. (Bedford Park Conservation Area)
1A Thornton Avenue, Chiswick, W4 1QE

FULL PLANNING PERMISSION REFUSED

Change of use from offices on ground and first floors to two x three bedroom self-contained flats incorporating roof light to existing building.

Flat 4 44 Woodstock Road, Chiswick, W4 1UF

FULL PLANNING PERMISSION REFUSED

Erection of rear balcony incorporating rear spiral staircase to rear garden and replacement of rear window with new sliding folding doors to existing first floor flat.

18-20 Chiswick High Road, Chiswick, W4 1TE

FULL PLANNING PERMISSION REFUSED

Erection of single storey side infill extension, removal of side access ramp and creation of new rear access ramp, removal of existing rear refuse enclosure and erection of single storey rear extension incorporating internal alterations together with the erection of first floor rear terrace area incorporating alterations to rear elevation to first floor flat.

7 Roman Road, Chiswick, W4 1NA

DETAILS PURSUANT APPROVED

Following approval for demolition of existing detached garage and erection of single storey side and part single storey rear extension to house - details submitted pursuant to Condition 3 (samples of materials - (Brick Type) London Reds - Wire Cut) of approved planning permission reference 01250/7/P3 dated 01/9/2004.

140 DEVONSHIRE ROAD, CHISWICK, W4 2AW

DETAILS PURSUANT APPROVED

Following approval for bricking up of the shop front installation of a new door and two windows, plus a new wall on the front elevation (for court to highways) to existing office on ground floor - details submitted pursuant to Condition 2 (Sample of materials) of approved planning permission ref 00354/140/P4 dated 25/05/2004.

20 Priory Avenue, Chiswick, W4 1TY

CONSERVATION TREE WORKS GRANTED

Works to Lime tree within Bedford Park Conservation Area.

Green Ash House Chiswick Mall, Chiswick, W4 2PW

CONSERVATION TREE WORKS GRANTED

Removal of Prunus domestica and Fastigiate Catalpa Bignonoides trees within Old Chiswick House Conservation Area.

11-13 Chiswick High Road, Chiswick, W4 2ND

LISTED BUILDINGS WORK GRANTED

Change of use of first floor of existing club to two-one bedroom self-contained flats. (Listed Building Application)

Fuller Smith And Turner Griffin Brewery Chiswick Lane South, Chiswick, W4 2QB

TELECOMS 28 NOTIFICATION AGREED

Erection of a radio base station consisting of 6 number panel antennas, 4 number transmission dish antenna and radio equipment housing of less than 2.5m3 at Fuller Griffin Brewery.
In CONSERVATION TREE WORKS REFUSED
Works to Acacia tree within Stamford Brook Conservation Area.

In LISTED BUILDINGS WORK REFUSED
Erection of single storey rear extension with rooflight over to house. (Bedford Park Conservation Area) (Listed Building Consent)

In LISTED BUILDINGS WORK GRANTED
Internal alterations to first floor, installation of a new window to rear elevation on first floor incorporating new soil stack to side elevation to existing house (Listed Building Consent)

In LISTED BUILDINGS WORK GRANTED
Demolition of external stair on ground and first floor and erection of single storey rear extension. Demolition of front side staircase and erection of single storey front extension and new parapet wall. Demolition of small area of wall at first floor level and replacement of two sash windows with single window and replacement of existing double doors with a new sash window to rear of first floor to existing house.

In LISTED BUILDINGS WORK GRANTED
Removal of existing pitched roof to single storey rear extension and extension of flat roof incorporating extended balustrade.

In LISTED BUILDINGS WORK GRANTED
Alterations to access doors and staircase on Chiswick High Road elevation, new disabled persons lift to front elevation. Internal and external alterations.

In LISTED BUILDINGS WORK GRANTED
Installation of 2 no rooflights to existing rear extension to house.

In LISTED BUILDINGS WORK GRANTED
External refurbishment and minor alterations, replacement of balustrade and window casements and installation of a new gate to front of house. (Listed Building Application)

In CONSERVATION TREE WORKS GRANTED
Works to Silver lime tree within Bedford Park Conservation Area

In CONSERVATION TREE WORKS GRANTED
Works to Mulberry tree within Old Chiswick Conservation Area.
00899/20/TA4  
P/2005/0689  
20 Priory Avenue, Chiswick, W4 1TY  
CONSERVATION TREE WORKS GRANTED  
Removal of Monkey Puzzle tree within Bedford Park Conservation Area.

00899/22/TA1  
P/2005/0857  
22 Priory Avenue, Chiswick, W4 1TY  
CONSERVATION TREE WORKS GRANTED  
Works to Lime tree within Bedford Park Conservation Area.

01030/16/CA1(A)  
P/2005/0804  
16 Hauteville Court Gardens, Chiswick, W6 0YF  
DETAILS PURSUANT APPROVED  
Following approval for demolition of small area of roof - details submitted pursuant to Condition 2 (carrying out works) of approved ref 01030/16/CA1 dated 25/02/2005.

00261/A/CA1(A)  
P/2005/0525  
Texaco Hogarth Filling Station Mawson Lane/Church Street, Chiswick, W4 2QD  
DETAILS PURSUANT APPROVED  
Following approval for demolition of existing brick kiosk, forecourt canopy and grub up the concrete slab and foundations of the existing filling station - details submitted pursuant to Condition 3 (Contamination) of approved planning permission ref 00261/A/CA1 dated 08/02/05.

00261/A/P25(C)  
P/2005/0523  
Texaco Hogarth Filling Station Mawson Lane/Church Street, Chiswick, W4 2QD  
DETAILS PURSUANT APPROVED  
Following approval for demolition of existing brick kiosk, forecourt canopy and grub up the concrete slab and foundations of the existing filling station - details submitted pursuant to Condition 3 (Contamination) of approved planning permission ref 00261/A/P25 dated 08/02/05.

00248/11-13/P14  
P/2005/0779  
11-13 Chiswick High Road, Chiswick, W4 2ND  
FULL PLANNING PERMISSION APPROVED  
Change of use of first floor of existing club to two-one bedroom self-contained flats.

00900/1/P8  
P/2005/0766  
1 Priory Gardens, Chiswick, W4 1TT  
FULL PLANNING PERMISSION APPROVED  
External refurbishment and minor alterations, replacement of balustrade and window casements and installation of a new gate to front of house. (Bedford Park Conservation Area)

00176/78/P7  
P/2005/0745  
78 Burlington Lane, Chiswick, W4 2RR  
FULL PLANNING PERMISSION APPROVED  
Demolition of existing fence, wall and gate to form a vehicular crossover, erection of a new wall and a gate to rear of existing house.

00250/S/TPOA7  
P/2005/0581  
Strawberry House Chiswick Mall, Chiswick, W4 2PS  
TREE PRESERVATION ORDER WORKS GRANTED  
Removal of Magnolia tree within L B of Hounslow tree preservation order no 102.

00622/4/P1  
P/2005/0294  
4 Homefield Road, Chiswick, W4 2LN  
FULL PLANNING PERMISSION APPROVED  
Erection of single storey side extension to house.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Permission Type</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01703/8/P1</td>
<td>P/2005/0334</td>
<td>8 Latimer Place, Chiswick, W4 2UA</td>
<td>FULL PLANNING PERMISSION APPROVED</td>
<td>Installation of 3 velux windows to front roof slope, 3 velux windows to rear roof slope, insertion of window into front and rear gable and conversion of loft space into bedroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01250/1B/P1</td>
<td>P/2005/0343</td>
<td>Oakley House 1B Roman Road, Chiswick</td>
<td>FULL PLANNING PERMISSION APPROVED</td>
<td>Installation of a new window to rear elevation of first floor incorporating internal alterations to existing house. (Bedford Park Conservation Area)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00248/144/P12</td>
<td>P/2005/0676</td>
<td>144 Chiswick High Road, Chiswick, W4 1PU</td>
<td>FULL PLANNING PERMISSION APPROVED</td>
<td>Erection of basement and ground floor rear extension to restaurant and alterations to rear staircase to existing first floor flat incorporating new railings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00250/C/P4</td>
<td>P/2005/0441</td>
<td>Woodroff House Chiswick Mall, Chiswick, W4 2PJ</td>
<td>FULL PLANNING PERMISSION APPROVED</td>
<td>Demolition of external stair on ground and first floor and erection of single storey rear extension. Demolition of front side staircase and erection of single storey front extension and new parapet wall. Demolition of small area of wall at first floor level and replacement of two sash windows with single window and replacement of existing double doors with a new sash window to rear of first floor to existing house.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00248/11-13/P12</td>
<td>P/2005/0504</td>
<td>11-13 Chiswick High Road, Chiswick, W4 2ND</td>
<td>FULL PLANNING PERMISSION APPROVED</td>
<td>Alterations to access doors and staircase on Chiswick High Road elevation, new disabled persons lift to front elevation. Internal and external alterations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00012/6/P3</td>
<td>P/2005/0567</td>
<td>6 Airedale Avenue, Chiswick, W4 2NW</td>
<td>FULL PLANNING PERMISSION APPROVED</td>
<td>Enlargement of existing basement to create a playroom and formation of a new lightwell with railings to front elevation to house.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00248/11-13/P13</td>
<td>P/2005/0769</td>
<td>11-13 Chiswick High Road, Chiswick, W4 2ND</td>
<td>FULL PLANNING PERMISSION APPROVED</td>
<td>Alteration to rear window on first floor of existing club.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chiswick Riverside</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00237/2a/CA1</td>
<td>P/2005/0812</td>
<td>Turrets 2a Chatsworth Road, Chiswick</td>
<td>CONSERVATION AREA APPROVAL</td>
<td>Demolition of existing rear conservatory to house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01076/48/P4</td>
<td>P/2005/0578</td>
<td>48 Strand-On-The-Green, Chiswick, W4 3PW</td>
<td>FULL PLANNING PERMISSION APPROVED</td>
<td>Demolition of existing garage and erection of two storey car port/ bedroom above, erection of single storey link and work room to existing house.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
00527/78/P2 P/2005/0621
78 Grove Park Road, Chiswick, W4 3QA
FULL PLANNING PERMISSION APPROVED
To reform the existing second floor at the rear of existing house by erection of gabled window to roof.

00237/2a/P10 P/2005/0813
Turrets 2a Chatsworth Road, Chiswick,
FULL PLANNING PERMISSION APPROVED
00237/2a P10 Demolition of existing rear conservatory and erection of a new single storey rear conservatory to house
00237/2a/CA1 Demolition of existing rear conservatory to house
(Two applications one for planning permission and one for conservation area consent)

01076/48/CA4 P/2005/0702
48 Strand-On-The-Green, Chiswick, W4 3PW
CONSERVATION AREA APPROVAL
Demolition of existing garage & store above (Strand on the Green Conservation Area)

01177/60A/TPOA1 P/2005/0890
60a Wellesley Road, Chiswick, W4 3AL
TREE PRESERVATION WORKS REFUSED
Cutting back of roots to Robinia tree within London Borough of Hounslow TPO Number 233.

01255/34/TPOA2 P/2005/0931
34 Park Road, Chiswick, W4 3HH
TREE PRESERVATION ORDER WORKS GRANTED
Works to Japanese Cherry Tree within London Borough of Hounslow TPO No 47.

00352/9/P5 P/2005/0354
9 Devonshire Gardens, Chiswick, W4 3TN
FULL PLANNING PERMISSION APPROVED
Demolition of existing rear conservatory and erection of single storey rear extension, and erection of side dormer window to second floor to existing house.

00525/58/P4 P/2005/0438
58 Grove Park Gardens, Chiswick, W4 3RZ
FULL PLANNING PERMISSION APPROVED
Installation of new side access gate, replacement of front entrance steps, recladding of 2nd floor cladding and replacement of second floor window with double glazed windows and increase in height of side wall to Grove Park Gardens to 2m.

00567/85/P1 P/2005/0439
85 Hartington Road, Chiswick, W4 3TU
FULL PLANNING PERMISSION APPROVED
Erection of new front and side wall with trellis above incorporating new gates to front elevation, installation of new front bay windows on ground and first floor, installation of new glazed doors to side entrance and garage and installation of roof light to front elevation to existing house.

01177/148/P6(A) P/2005/0806
Flat 1 Waters Edge 148 Wellesley Road, Chiswick, W4 3AX
DETAILS PURSUANT APPROVED
Following approval for conversion of existing filming studio to two x one bedroom flats and 1 x two bedroom flats in basement - details submitted pursuant to Condition 3 (Sound insulation) of approved planning permission ref 01177/148/P6 dated 25/11/2004

00237/2A/TA2 P/2005/0869
The Turrets, 2a Chatsworth Road, Chiswick, W4 3HY
CONSERVATION TREE WORKS REFUSED
Removal of one Silver Birch tree within Chiswick House Conservation Area.
00528/27/TA1 P/2005/0546
27 Grove Park Terrace, Chiswick, W4 3JL
CONSERVATION TREE WORKS GRANTED
Works to 1 X Silver Birch tree within Grove Park Conservation Area.

00528/52/TA1 P/2005/0909
52 Grove Park Terrace, Chiswick, W4 3QE
CONSERVATION TREE WORKS GRANTED
Works to 1 X Silver Birch tree in front garden within Strand on the Green Conservation Area.

00723/9/TA1 P/2005/0897
9 Magnolia Road, Chiswick, W4 3QY
CONSERVATION TREE WORKS GRANTED
Works to Silver Birch tree within Strand on the Green Conservation Area.

01069/42/TA4 P/2005/0700
42 Staveley Road, Chiswick, W4 3ES
CONSERVATION TREE WORKS GRANTED
Works to Acacia tree within Chiswick House Conservation Area.

01069/42/TA5 P/2005/1025
42 Staveley Road, Chiswick, W4 3ES
CONSERVATION TREE WORKS GRANTED
Removal of Magnolia tree within Chiswick House Conservation Area.

00527/60/TA1 P/2004/3626
60 Grove Park Road, Chiswick, W4 3SD
CONSERVATION TREE WORKS GRANTED
Works to a tree within Grove Park Conservation Area. (PLEASE NOTE CHANGE OF SITE ADDRESS)

00237/4/TA1 P/2005/0848
4 Chatsworth Road, Chiswick, W4 3HY
CONSERVATION TREE WORKS GRANTED
Removal of two Yew and one Cherry tree within Chiswick House Conservation Area

00527/41-43/P13(D) P/2004/3867
41-43 Grove Park Road, Chiswick, W4 3RU
DETAILS PURSUANT APPROVED
Following approval for proposed change of use from offices together with extensions and alterations to provide nine 2-bedroom and one 1-bedroom flat and demolition of existing extension and buildings details submitted pursuant to Condition 6 (Landscape management plan) of approved permission reference 00527/41-43/P13 dated 23/09/2003.

01177/148/P6(B) P/2005/0808
Flat 1 Waters Edge 148 Wellesley Road, Chiswick, W4 3AX
DETAILS PURSUANT APPROVED
Following approval for conversion of existing filming studio to two x one bedroom flats and 1 x two bedroom flats in basement - details submitted pursuant to Condition 4 (Storage of waste and materials for recycling) of approved planning permission ref 01177/148/P6 dated 25/11/2004

01255/130/TA2 P/2005/0536
130 Park Road, Chiswick, W4 3HP
CONSERVATION TREE WORKS GRANTED
Removal of apple tree within Chiswick House Conservation area.

00237/2A/TA1 P/2005/0522
2a Chatsworth Road, Chiswick, W4 3HY
CONSERVATION TREE WORKS GRANTED
Removal of 3 - Cypress trees within Chiswick House Conservation Area.
00197/42/TA1 P/2005/0544
42 Cambridge Road South, Chiswick, W4 3DA
CONSERVATION TREE WORKS GRANTED
Works to 2 X Sycamore trees within Wellesley Road Conservation Area.

00244/30A/P3 P/2005/0308
30A Chesterfield Road And, Chiswick, W4 3HG
FULL PLANNING PERMISSION REFUSED
Demolition of existing garage and erection of a two storey 3 - bedroom house (Chiswick House C/A)

00244/30A/CA1 P/2005/0306
30A Chesterfield Road, Chiswick, W4 3HG
CONSERVATION AREA REFUSAL
Demolition of existing garage & store room and erection of a two storey 3 - bedroom house. (Chiswick House Conservation Area)

00988/77/LAW2 P/2005/0347
77 St Mary’S Grove, Chiswick, W4 3LW
LAWFUL PERMISSION NOT REQUIRED
Certificate of Lawfulness for the demolition of existing rear extension and erection of single storey side infill and rear extension and blocking up side first floor window to existing house.

00528/22/LAW1 P/2005/0564
22 Grove Park Terrace, Chiswick, W4 3QG
LAWFUL PERMISSION NOT REQUIRED
Certificate of Lawfulness for the erection of single storey rear infill extension to house.

01046/35/P4 P/2005/0415
35 Spring Grove, Chiswick, W4 3NH
FULL PLANNING PERMISSION REFUSED
Erection of a single storey rear/side extension to house.

01046/37/P2 P/2005/0436
37 Spring Grove, Chiswick, W4 3NH
FULL PLANNING PERMISSION REFUSED
Erection of single storey rear/side extension to house.

00528/22/P1 P/2005/0591
22 Grove Park Terrace, Chiswick, W4 3QG
FULL PLANNING PERMISSION REFUSED
Erection of roof extension to house

01076/57/P3 P/2005/0826
57 Strand-On-The-Green, Chiswick, W4 3PE
FULL PLANNING PERMISSION REFUSED
Demolition of the existing shed and erection of part single storey rear extension, part two storey rear extension and erection of roof extension incorporating internal and side elevation alterations to house

00670/3/P1 P/2005/0815
3 Kinnaird Avenue, Chiswick, W4 3SH
FULL PLANNING PERMISSION REFUSED
Erection of side and rear roof extensions to house

00381/18/P1 P/2005/0468
18 Eastbourne Road, Chiswick, W4 3EB
WITHDRAWN
Erection of single storey rear extension, covered terrace and conversion of existing garage to a study room and provision of one parking space to the front of existing house.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01375/4/TA2</td>
<td>P/2005/1000</td>
<td>4 Chara Place, Chiswick, W4 3DX</td>
<td>WITHDRAWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pruning of Scots Pine in front garden within Chiswick House Conservation Area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00897/79/CA1</td>
<td>P/2005/0321</td>
<td>79 Princes Avenue, Chiswick, W3 8LX</td>
<td>CONSERVATION AREA REFUSAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Demolition of existing rear extension and side garage and erection of single storey side and rear extension and erection of a new garage in rear garden to existing house.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00034/31/LAW1</td>
<td>P/2005/0524</td>
<td>31 Alwyn Avenue, Chiswick, W4 4PA</td>
<td>LAWFUL PERMISSION NOT REQUIRED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Certificate of lawfulness for the erection of roof extension incorporating roof light to front elevation to existing house.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00248/446/P7</td>
<td>P/2005/1004</td>
<td>446 Chiswick High Road, Chiswick, W4 5TT</td>
<td>FULL PLANNING PERMISSION REFUSED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Retension of roller shutter to front elevation of existing shop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00177/FLAT2A-41/</td>
<td>P/2005/0737</td>
<td>Flat 2a 41 Burlington Road, Chiswick, W4 4BE</td>
<td>FULL PLANNING PERMISSION REFUSED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Erection of a first floor side extension to existing ground floor flat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00897/79/P2</td>
<td>P/2005/0307</td>
<td>79 Princes Avenue, Chiswick, W3 8LX</td>
<td>FULL PLANNING PERMISSION REFUSED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Demolition of existing attached garage utility and kitchen and erection of single storey side and rear extension. Erection of single storey detached garage in rear garden to existing house. (Gunnersbury Park Conservation Area)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01164/20/P5</td>
<td>P/2005/0309</td>
<td>20 Walpole Gardens, Chiswick, W4 4HG</td>
<td>FULL PLANNING PERMISSION REFUSED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Erection of a three storey building at rear yard to create one x 3 bedroom terrace house and erection of roof extension to create one x 1 bedroom self contained flat with one parking incorporating a new lobby to rear elevation to existing building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00897/29/P1</td>
<td>P/2005/0338</td>
<td>29 Princes Avenue, Chiswick, W3 8LX</td>
<td>FULL PLANNING PERMISSION REFUSED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Erection of roof extension incorporating roof lights to front elevation to existing house (Gunnersbury Park Conservation Area).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application No.</td>
<td>Full Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 00248/610-624/P32 | Lovell House 610-624 Chiswick High Road, Chiswick, W4 5RU  
In FULL PLANNING PERMISSION REFUSED  
Demolition of existing office building and car showroom and erection of 12 storey building with front and rear balconies. The ground floor will contain 605m2 retail, with 10 surface parking spaces, storeys 2-12 will contain 127 flats (75 x 1 bed, 41 x 2 bed, 11 x 3 bed) of which 45 will be affordable (34x1 bed & 11x 2 bed) 70 parking spaces are proposed below ground to the rear with access off Thorney Hedge Road. A raised amenity area of 1045m2 is proposed at the rear above this parking. |
| 00854/78/P1 | 78 Park Drive, Chiswick, W3 8NB  
In FULL PLANNING PERMISSION REFUSED  
Retention of front UPVC windows and door to house |
| 00334/10/LAW1 | 10 Dale Street, Chiswick, W4 2BL  
In LAWFUL PERMISSION NOT REQUIRED  
Certificate of Lawfulness for the demolition of rear shed and utility room and erection of single storey rear extension and erection of roof extension to house. |
| 01217/17/LAW1 | 17 Windmill Road, Chiswick, W4 1RN  
In LAWFUL PERMISSION NOT REQUIRED  
Certificate of lawfulness for the demolition of existing lean to extension and erection of single storey rear and side extension to existing house. |
| 01176/32/P1 | 32 Wavendon Avenue, Chiswick, W4 4NR  
In WITHDRAWN  
Demolition of existing rear/side structure and erection of single storey rear/side extension to house. |
| 01121/75/P1(A) | 75 Thorney Hedge Road, Chiswick, W4 5SB  
In DETAILS PURSUANT APPROVED  
Following approval for erection of a two storey rear/side extension, 2nd rear roof extension to create three x two bedroom flats and one x one bed flat and off street parking - details submitted pursuant to condition 2 (samples of materials) and condition 4 (landscaping) of approved appeal permission dated 11/10/2004. |
| 00589/2-4/TA2 | Chiswick Fire Station 2-4 Heathfield Gardens, Chiswick, W4 4JY  
In CONSERVATION TREE WORKS GRANTED  
Works to Common Crab Apple, 2 X Lime and 1 x Japanese cherry tree and removal of elder tree within Wellesley Road Conservation Area. |
| 00571/9/TA1 | 9 Harvard Road, Chiswick, W4 4EA  
In CONSERVATION TREE WORKS GRANTED  
Works to 3 Poplar trees within Wellesley Road Conservation Area. |
| 00571/23/TA1 | 23 Harvard Road, Chiswick, W4 4EA  
In CONSERVATION TREE WORKS GRANTED  
Works to Walnut tree within Wellesley Road Conservation Area. |
| 00731/16/LAW2 | 16 Manor Gardens, Chiswick, W3 8JU  
In LAWFUL PERMISSION REQUIRED  
Certificate of Lawfulness for the erection of a rear roof extension to house. |
00248/548-550/P15 P/2004/3268
458-550 CHISWICK HIGH ROAD, CHISWICK, W4 5RG
DETAILS PURSUANT REFUSED
Following approval for demolition of existing building and construction of 43 self contained flats on five floors, with ground floor B1 and/or A2 uses and showroom with 30 car parking spaces - details submitted pursuant to Condition 10 (parking) of planning permission reference 00248/548-550/P15 approved 28/3/02.

00074/1-4/P5(B) P/2005/0410
1-4 Barley Mow Passage, Chiswick, W4 4PH
DETAILS PURSUANT REFUSED
Following approval for erection of a two storey restaurant with basement details submitted pursuant to Condition 7 (control of noise) of approved planning permission reference 00074/1-4/P5 dated 01/09/2004, Condition 8 (fumes and odours) and condition 11 (disabled access).

00248/650-654/NO P/2005/0671
Wheatstone House, 650-654 Chiswick High Road, Chiswick, W4 5SA
TELECOMS 28 NOTIFICATION AGREED
Exchange of 3 X existing antennae with 3 X UK broad brand antennae of the same size and scale.

01177/11/TPOA1 P/2005/0870
11 Wellesley Road, Chiswick, W4 4BS
NO FURTHER ACTION

00897/29/P2 P/2005/0340
29 Princes Avenue, Chiswick, W3 8LX
NO FURTHER ACTION
Erection of single storey rear extension to existing house. (Gunnersbury Park Conservation Area)

00940/A/TA3 P/2005/0353
Gunnersbury Triangle Club The Ridgeway, Chiswick, W3 8LN
CONSERVATION TREE WORKS REFUSED
Removal of Cypress tree within Gunnersbury Park Conservation Area.

00535/150/LAW1 P/2005/0783
150 Gunnersbury Avenue (North Circular Road), Chiswick, W3 8LB
LAWFUL PERMISSION REQUIRED
Certificate of Lawfulness for the demolition of existing rear kitchen and shed and erection of single storey rear extension to house.

01094/21/LAW2 P/2005/0619
21 Sutton Lane North, Chiswick, W4 4LA
LAWFUL PERMISSION REQUIRED
Certificate of Lawfulness for the demolition of existing rear shed, insertion of a new door to side elevation on ground floor and raising the existing roof, replacement of front windows with sash windows incorporating internal alterations to ground and first floor of existing house.

00590/23/L4 P/2005/0824
23 Heathfield Terrace, Chiswick, W4 4JE
LISTED BUILDINGS WORK GRANTED
Opening up works to basement and ground floor levels, and relocation of bathroom, already carried out.

01021/26/TA1 P/2005/0910
26 Silver Crescent, Chiswick, W4 5SE
CONSERVATION TREE WORKS GRANTED
Felling of Eucalyptus tree and works to 1 X Common Apple tree within Thorney Hedge Conservation Area.
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00847/6/TA2  P/2005/0740
6 Oxford Road North, Chiswick, W4 4DN
CONSERVATION TREE WORKS GRANTED
Works to Cherry, Walnut, Willow, Hawthorn and 2 x plum trees and removal of Conifer tree on the with 4 Oxford Road North within Wellesley Road Conservation Area

00175/10/TA1  P/2005/0623
10 Burlington Gardens, Chiswick, W4 4LT
CONSERVATION TREE WORKS GRANTED
Removal of a Spruce tree within Wellesley Road Conservation Area.

00535/218/CA1  P/2005/0711
218 Gunnersbury Avenue (North Circular Road), Chiswick, W3 8LB
CONSERVATION AREA APPROVAL
Demolition of the existing rear structure. Erection of a single storey rear extension, and erection of a rear roof extension incorporating two roof windows to front elevation to house.

00177/11/P2  P/2005/0739
Flat 3 11 Burlington Road, Chiswick, W4 4BQ
FULL PLANNING PERMISSION APPROVED
Erection of a roof extension to existing top flat, comprising 2 rear roof window extensions, one side roof extension, one rooflight to rear elevation and one rooflight to front elevation.

01121/58/P1  P/2005/0798
58 Thorney Hedge Road, Chiswick, W4 5SD
FULL PLANNING PERMISSION APPROVED
Formation of vehicular crossover to existing maisonette.

01091/19A/P1  P/2005/0010
Flat 1 19 Sutton Court Road, Chiswick, W4 4NN
FULL PLANNING PERMISSION APPROVED
Erection of single storey side and rear infill extension to ground floor flat. (Amended Description)

00248/296/AD6  P/2005/0492
296 Chiswick High Road, Chiswick, W4 1PA
ADVERT APPROVAL
Installation of externally illuminated fascia and projecting signs to existing shop.

00354/11A/P7  P/2005/0363
11A Devonshire Road, Chiswick, W4 2EU
FULL PLANNING PERMISSION APPROVED
Demolition of existing rear extension to retail shop and ground floor and erection of two-storey side and rear extension and single storey rear extension to shop and ground first floor flat.
00248/389/P2  P/2005/0512
British Standards Institution 389 Chiswick High Road, Chiswick, W4 4AL
FULL PLANNING PERMISSION APPROVED In
Extending the existing safety railing system in use on the two storey annex roof to existing office building.

00535/218/P1  P/2005/0710
218 Gunnersbury Avenue (North Circular Road), Chiswick, W3 8LB
FULL PLANNING PERMISSION APPROVED In
Demolition of the existing rear structure. Erection of a single storey rear extension, and erection of a rear roof extension incorporating two roof windows to front elevation to house.

00522/36/P1  P/2005/0819
36 Grosvenor Road, Chiswick, W4 4EG
FULL PLANNING PERMISSION APPROVED In
Erection of single storey rear extension incorporating new bedroom window to side elevation to existing ground floor flat.

00079/110/P2  P/2005/0840
110 Barrowgate Road, Chiswick, W4 4QP
FULL PLANNING PERMISSION APPROVED In
Retention of single storey rear extension to house.

Contact: Marilyn Smith
Telephone: 020 8583 4994

Background papers: This report has been or is due to be considered by:
Chiswick Area Area Planning Committee

This report is relevant to the following wards:
Turnham Green, Chiswick Riverside and Chiswick Homefields
Better Local Government

CHISWICK AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE – 25th May 2005
Delegated Decisions - Trees

Report by: Borough Planning Officer

Summary
List of delegated decisions for trees taken between 19 March 2005 and 13 May 2005

RECOMMENDATION
That members note the report

TPO’s in a Conservation Area
01255/130/TA2  
P/2005/0536  
130 Park Road Chiswick W4 3HP

Removal of apple tree within Chiswick House Conservation area.
Decision: TREECONA  
Date: 24 Mar 2005

**Conditions**

1  NON-STD
   GRANT

**Reasons**

1  NON-STD
   That the following works at 130 Park Road, Chiswick be GRANTED:
      1 x Apple tree: Removal.

2  NON-STD
   Informative:
      1. The work shall be carried out to BS3998 (1989) by a competent arboriculturalist and that no climbing irons are to be used.

---

00893/62/TA2  
P/2005/0356  
62 Prebend Gardens Chiswick W6 0XU

Works to Acacia tree within Stamford Brook Conservation Area.
Decision: TREECONNR  
Date: 24 Mar 2005

**Conditions**

1  NON-STD
   REFUSE

2  NON-STD
   Informative
      A Tree Preservation order has been imposed on the tree.

**Reasons**

1  NON-STD
   The proposed works are considered excessive and likely to harm the appearance, health and amenity of the tree that and would not preserve the character of Stamford Brook Conservation Area in terms of ENV-N2.7 and ENV-B.2.2 of Council's UDP, 2003.

2  NON-STD
   In order to safeguard the visual amenity of Stamford Brook Conservation Area.

---

00237/2A/TA1  
P/2005/0522  
2a Chatsworth Road Chiswick W4 3HY

Removal of 3 - Cypress trees within Chiswick House Conservation Area.
Decision: TREECONA  
Date: 29 Mar 2005

**Conditions**

1  NON-STD
   GRANT

**Reasons**

1  NON-STD
   That the following works at 2a Chatsworth Road, Chiswick be GRANTED:
      3 x Leyland Cypress Trees: Removal.

2  NON-STD
   Informative:
      1. The work shall be carried out to BS3998 (1989) by a competent arboriculturalist and that no climbing irons are to be used.
      2. TPO placed on Silver Birch tree, originally applied for with this application, for the retention of the tree pending further investigation/monitoring.
Reference

00571/23/TA1  P/2005/0529
23 Harvard Road Chiswick W4 4EA
Works to Walnut tree within Wellesley Road Conservation Area.
Decision: TREECONA  Date: 29 Mar 2005

Conditions
1  NON-STD
   GRANT

Reasons
1  NON-STD
   That the following works at 23 Harvard Road, Chiswick be GRANTED:
      1 x Walnut tree: Crown reduce by 30% to appropriate sub-lateral branch.

2  NON-STD
   Informative:
      1. The work shall be carried out to BS3998 (1989) by a competent arboriculturalist and that no climbing iron
         are to be used.

00006/16/TA6  P/2005/0590
16 Addison Grove Chiswick W4 1ER
Works to Silver lime tree within Bedford Park Conservation Area
Decision: TREECONA  Date: 31 Mar 2005

Conditions
1  NON-STD
   GRANT

Reasons
1  NON-STD
   That the following works at 16 Addison Grove, Chiswick be GRANTED:
      1 x Silver lime tree: Crown reduce to just outside previous reduction points (removal of re-growth from
      previous/last reduction) and crown lift to 6m.

2  NON-STD
   Informative:
      1. The work shall be carried out to BS2998 (1989) by a competent arboriculturalist and that no climbing iron
         are to be used.

01177/11/TPOA1  P/2005/0870
11 Wellesley Road Chiswick W4 4BS
Decision: NFA  Date: 6 Apr 2005

00197/42/TA1  P/2005/0544
42 Cambridge Road South Chiswick W4 3DA
Works to 2 X Sycamore trees within Wellesley Road Conservation Area.
Decision: TREECONA  Date: 7 Apr 2005

Conditions
1  NON-STD
   GRANT

Reasons
1  NON-STD
   That the following works at 42 Cambridge Road South, Chiswick be GRANTED:
      2x Sycamore: Cut back to boundary with 1a Brooks Road.

   Informative:
      1. The work shall be carried out to BS2998 (1989) by a competent arboriculturalist and that no climbing iron
         are to be used.
01286/A/TA4  
P/2005/0685  
Netheravon House 1 Netheravon Road South Chiswick W4 2PY  
Works to Mulberry tree within Old Chiswick Conservation Area.  
Decision: TREECONA  
Date: 12 Apr 2005  

Conditions  
1 NON-STD  
A 20% reduction to the Mulberry tree located in the rear garden and removal of dead wood is hereby granted.  

13. CONDITIONS AND REASONS  
Works to the Mulberry tree located in the rear garden should be carried out in-line with current industry best practice by a competent Arboriculturalist and no climbing irons are to be used. A list of contractors is available from the Arboricultural Association on Tel 01794 368717 or www.trees.org.uk  

Reason  
To safeguard the health of the trees  

2 NON-STD  
Informative  
Works to the Mulberry tree located in the rear garden should be carried out in-line with current industry best practice by a competent Arboriculturalist and no climbing irons are to be used. A list of contractors is available from the Arboricultural Association on Tel 01794 368717 or www.trees.org.uk  

Reasons  
1 NON-STD  

2 NON-STD  
To safeguard the health of the trees  

00250/S/TPOA7  
P/2005/0581  
Strawberry House Chiswick Mall Chiswick W4 2PS  
Removal of Magnolia tree within L B of Hounslow tree preservation order no 102.  
Decision: TPOA  
Date: 12 Apr 2005  

Conditions  
1 NON-STD  
APPROVE  

2 NON-STD  
One extra heavy duty standard tree shall be planted within the curtilage of the site in the planting season immediately following the removal of the Magnolia tree, in a position and of a size and species to be agreed by the Local Planning Authority and thereafter permanently maintained. Planting advice can be provided by the Council's CIP Commercial Services on 0208 894 2677. It must be noted that replanting with the same species in the same location may be inappropriate.  

Reasons  
1 NON-STD  

2 NON-STD  
In order to safeguard the visual amenity of the Old Chiswick Conservation Area.  

00250/J/TA3  
P/2005/0625  
Green Ash House Chiswick Mall Chiswick W4 2PW  
Removal of Prunus domestica and Fastigiate Catalpa Bignonoides trees within Old Chiswick House Conservation Area.  
Decision: TREECONA  
Date: 12 Apr 2005  

Conditions  
1 NON-STD  
APPROVE  

Reasons  
1 NON-STD  
Informative  
Two suitable replacement trees are recommended, such as ornamental trees and shrubs in the planting season immediately following the removal of the trees and thereafter permanently maintained. Planting advice can be provided by the Council's CIP Commercial Services on 0208 894 2677.
Reference

00528/27/TA1  
P/2005/0546

27 Grove Park Terrace Chiswick W4 3JL

Works to 1 X Silver Birch tree within Grove Park Conservation Area.

Decision:  TREECONA  
Date:  14 Apr 2005

Conditions

1  NON-STD
   GRANT

Reasons

1  NON-STD
   That the following works at 27 Grove Park Terrace, Chiswick be GRANTED:
   1 x Silver Birch Tree: Crown reduction of 20%.

Informative:
1. The work shall be carried out to BS3998 (1989) by a competent arboriculturalist and that no climbing irons are to be used.

00528/52/TA1  
P/2005/0909

52 Grove Park Terrace Chiswick W4 3QE

Works to 1 X Silver Birch tree in front garden within Strand on the Green Conservation Area.

Decision:  TREECONA  
Date:  14 Apr 2005

Conditions

1  NON-STD
   GRANT

Reasons

1  NON-STD
   That the following works at 52 Grove Park Terrace, Chiswick be GRANTED:
   1 x Silver Birch Tree: Crown reduce by 25-30%.

Informative:
1. The work shall be carried out to BS3998: 1989 by a competent Arboriculturalist & that no climbing irons are used.

00723/9/TA1  
P/2005/0897

9 Magnolia Road Chiswick W4 3QY

Works to Silver Birch tree within Strand on the Green Conservation Area.

Decision:  TREECONA  
Date:  14 Apr 2005

Conditions

1  NON-STD
   GRANT

Reasons

1  NON-STD
   That the following works at 9 Magnolia Road, Chiswick be GRANTED:
   1 x Silver Birch tree: Crown reduce by 20%.

Informative:
1. The work shall be carried out to BS3998: 1989 by a competent Arboriculturalist & that no climbing irons are used.
00847/6/TA2  
**P/2005/0740**  
6 Oxford Road North Chiswick W4 4DN  
Works to Cherry, Walnut, Willow, Hawthorn and 2 x plum trees and removal of Conifer tree on the with 4 Oxford Road North within Wellesley Road Conservation Area  
Decision: TREECONA  
Date: 15 Apr 2005  

**Conditions**  
1 NON-STD  
\[\text{GRANT}\]  

**Reasons**  
1 NON-STD  
That the following works at 6 Oxford Road North, Chiswick be GRANTED:  
1 x Cherry, 1 x Walnut, 1 x Willow, 1 x Hawthorn, 2 x Plum, located in rear garden: Crown reduce by 30%.  
1 x Conifer, located on boundary with 4 Oxford Road North: Removal.  
Informative:  
1. The work shall be carried out to BS3998 (1989) by a competent arboriculturalist and that no climbing irons are to be used.

00899/20/TA4  
**P/2005/0689**  
20 Priory Avenue Chiswick W4 1TY  
Removal of Monkey Puzzle tree within Bedford Park Conservation Area.  
Decision: TREECONA  
Date: 15 Apr 2005  

**Conditions**  
1 NON-STD  
\[\text{GRANT}\]  

2 NON-STD  
\[\text{INFORMATIVE}\]  
A suitable replacement is required, such as an ornamental tree or shrub. Planting advice can be provided by CiP Tree Section on 020 8894 2677.

**Reasons**  
1 NON-STD  
The removal of the tree is not considered to harm the character of the street scene and Conservation Area in terms of policies ENV-N.2.7 and ENV-B.2.2 of Council's Unitary Development Plan, adopted December 2003.  
2 NON-STD  
To preserve the character of the Conservation Area.

01069/42/TA4  
**P/2005/0700**  
42 Staveley Road Chiswick W4 3ES  
Works to Acacia tree within Chiswick House Conservation Area.  
Decision: TREECONA  
Date: 15 Apr 2005  

**Conditions**  
1 NON-STD  
\[\text{GRANTED}\]  

2 NON-STD  
\[\text{INFORMATIVE}\]  
Work to the Acacia tree in the rear garden should be carried out in-line with current industry best practice by a competent Arboriculturalist and that no climbing irons are used. A list of contractors is available from the Arboricultural Association on Tel 01794 368717 or www.trees.org.uk

**Reasons**  
1 NON-STD  
Crown lift of 10% of the lower limbs of Acacia tree in the rear garden.  
2 NON-STD  
To safeguard the health of the tree.  
3 NON-STD  
00527/60/TA1  
**P/2004/3626**

60 Grove Park Road Chiswick W4 3SD

Works to a tree within Grove Park Conservation Area.  **(PLEASE NOTE CHANGE OF SITE ADDRESS)**

Decision: TRECONA  
Date: 19 Apr 2005

**Reasons**

1  NON-STD

That the following works to 1x Eucalyptus tree within the Grove Park Conservation Area be GRANTED:

- Fell to ground level

Informative:

1. It is recommended that the tree works should be carried out to BS Specification 3998 (1989).

---

00589/2-4/TA2  
**P/2005/0939**

Chiswick Fire Station 2-4 Heathfield Gardens Chiswick W4 4JY

Works to Common Crab Apple, 2 X Lime and 1 x Japanese cherry tree and removal of elder tree within Wellesley Road Conservation Area.

Decision: TRECONA  
Date: 21 Apr 2005

**Conditions**

1  NON-STD

GRANT

**Reasons**

1  NON-STD

That the following works at 2-4 Heathfield Gardens, Chiswick be GRANTED:

Description of trees:  

- 1 x Crab Apple, at front of station  
- 2 x Lime, on site perimeter  
- 1 x Japanese cherry, located at rear of site  
- 1 x elder, located on site boundary

Prune back dead branch tips to live growth points and apply GSM1 (general maintenance schedule 1).

General Maintenance Schedule 1

General Maintenance Schedule 1

Removal

Informative:

1. The work shall be carried out to BS3998 (1989) by a competent arboriculturalist and that no climbing iron are to be used.

2. Only decisions have been made on the trees which fall within the remit covered by a section 211 notice.
Reference

00571/9/TA1

P/2005/0896

9 Harvard Road Chiswick W4 4EA

Works to 3 Poplar trees within Wellesley Road Conservation Area.

Decision: TREECONA Date: 21 Apr 2005

Conditions

1 NON-STD GRANTED

Reasons

1 NON-STD

That the following works at 9 Harvard Road, Chiswick be GRANTED:
3 x Poplar trees located in rear garden: Crown reduce back no further than the previous reduction cuts, cut back over boundaries as discussed.

Informative:
1. The work shall be carried out to BS3998 (1989) by a competent arboriculturalist and that no climbing irons are used.
2. In addition this consent may be repeated up to twice within a six year period (20th April 2005 - 20th April 2011) without the need for a repeat application. Should the ownership of the trees change then this consent will become invalid.

Informative:
1. The work shall be carried out to BS3998 (1989) by a competent arboriculturalist and that no climbing irons are used.

00237/4/TA1

P/2005/0848

4 Chatsworth Road Chiswick W4 3HY

Removal of two Yew and one Cherry tree within Chiswick House Conservation Area

Decision: TREECONA Date: 21 Apr 2005

Conditions

1 NON-STD GRANTED

Reasons

1 NON-STD

That the following works at 4 Chatsworth Road, Chiswick be GRANTED:
2 x Yew and 1 x Cherry, located in the rear garden: Removal.

Informative:
1. The work shall be carried out to BS3998 (1989) by a competent arboriculturalist and that no climbing irons are used.
2. It is recommended that three suitable replacement trees are planted in the rear garden in a suitable location. Advice on replacement trees and planting is available from the CIP Tree Section - ph: 0208 894 2677.

00899/20/TA5

P/2005/0850

20 Priory Avenue Chiswick W4 1TY

Works to Lime tree within Bedford Park Conservation Area.

Decision: TREECONA Date: 21 Apr 2005

Conditions

1 NON-STD GRANTED

Reasons

1 NON-STD

That the following works at 20 Priory Avenue, Chiswick be GRANTED:
1 x Lime tree, located in rear garden: Crown reduce by 15% and thin by 20%.

Informative:
1. The work shall be carried out to BS3998 (1989) by a competent arboriculturalist and that no climbing irons are to be used.
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Reference

00899/22/TA1    P/2005/0857
22 Priory Avenue Chiswick W4 1TY
Works to Lime tree within Bedford Park Conservation Area.  
Decision: TREECONA Date: 21 Apr 2005

Conditions
1  NON-STD
   GRANTED

Reasons
1  NON-STD
   That the following works at 22 Priory Avenue, Chiswick be GRANTED:
   1 x Lime tree, located in rear garden: Crown reduce by 25% and thin by 20%.

Informative:
1. The work shall be carried out to BS3998 (1989) by a competent arboriculturalist and that no climbing irons are to be used.

01255/34/TPOA2 P/2005/0931
34 Park Road Chiswick W4 3HH
Works to Japanese Cherry Tree within London Borough of Hounslow TPO No 47.
Decision: TPOA Date: 26 Apr 2005

Conditions
1  NON-STD
   GRANTED

Reasons
1  NON-STD
   That the following works at 34 Park Road, Chiswick be GRANTED:
   2 x Japanese cherry trees: Crown reduce back no further than the previous reduction points.

Informative:
1. The work shall be carried out to BS3998 (1989) by a competent arboriculturalist and that no climbing irons are used.

01375/4/TA2 P/2005/1000
4 Chara Place Chiswick W4 3DX
Pruning of Scots Pine in front garden within Chiswick House Conservation Area.
Decision: WITHDRAWN Date: 3 May 2005

00237/2A/TA2 P/2005/0869
The Turrets, 2a Chatsworth Road Chiswick W4 3HY
Removal of one Silver Birch tree within Chiswick House Conservation Area.
Decision: TREECONR Date: 3 May 2005

Conditions
1  NON-STD
   The Silver Birch tree has not been linked as a direct cause of the subsidence problems at the property.
   The removal of the tree would have a negative effect on the street scene and character and appearance of chiswick House Conservation Area.

Reasons
1  NON-STD
   A Tree Preservation Order is placed on the Silver Birch tree for the retention of the tree pending further investigation/monitoring.
Reference

01021/26/TA1 P/2005/0910
26 Silver Crescent Chiswick W4 5SE
Felling of Eucalyptus tree and works to 1 X Common Apple tree within Thorney Hedge Conservation Area.
Decision: TREECONA Date: 3 May 2005

Conditions
1 NON-STD
GRANT

Reasons
1 NON-STD
That the following works at 26 Silver Crescent, Chiswick be GRANTED:
1 x Eucalyptus, located in rear garden: Removed
1 x Apple, located in rear garden: Crown reduction to previous reduction points and shape.

Informative:
1. The work shall be carried out to BS3998 (1989) by a competent arboriculturalist and that no climbing irons are to be used.

00940/A/TA3 P/2005/0353
Gunnersbury Triangle Club The Ridgeway Chiswick W3 8LN
Removal of Cypress tree within Gunnersbury Park Conservation Area.
Decision: TREECONR Date: 3 May 2005

Reasons
1 NON-STD
That the following works at Gunnersbury Triangle Club, Chiswick be refused:
1 x Cypress tree: Removal.

Informative:
1. A Tree Preservation Order has been placed on this tree

01177/60A/TPOA1 P/2005/0890
60a Wellesley Road Chiswick W4 3AL
Cutting back of roots to Robinia tree within London Borough of Hounslow TPO Number 233.
Decision: TPOR Date: 3 May 2005

Conditions
1 NON-STD
REFUSE

Reasons
1 NON-STD
1 x Robinia tree located in front garden: Application to cut back roots to tree refused.
Reasons:
1. To sever roots this close to such a mature tree is likely to cause serious structural instability. We would advise that another solution is arrived at to stabilise/replace the wall.

Informative:
1. It would be highly advisable to sever and/or remove the ivy.

00006/3/TPOA4 P/2005/0899
3 Addison Grove Chiswick W4 1EP
Decision: TPOR Date: 10 May 2005

Reasons
1 NON-STD
That the following works at 3 Addison Grove, Chiswick be REFUSED:
1 x Lime, located within the rear garden: Fell to ground level and treatment of stump.

REASONS:
It is considered that the removal of the Lime tree at 3 Addison Grove, Chiswick would be detrimental to the visual amenity of the area and would not preserve or enhance the Bedford Park Conservation Area.

It is considered the health of the tree will be benefited with regular pruning.
0006/3/TA6  P/2005/1248
3 Addison Grove Chiswick W4 1EP
Removal of Eucalyptus tree within Bedford Park Conservation Area.
Decision: TREECONA  Date: 10 May 2005

Reasons
1 NON-STD
   That the following works at 3 Addison Grove, Chiswick be GRANTED:
   1 x Eucalyptus, located in the rear garden: Fell to ground level and treatment of stump.

INFORMATIVES:
1. It is recommended that a suitable replacement tree be planted, such as an ornamental tree or shrub.
   Advice on replacement trees and planting is available from the CIP Tree Section - ph: 0208 894 2677.
2. The work shall be carried out to BS2998 (1989) by a competent arboriculturalist and that no climbing irons
   are to be used.
3. This approval does not override property rights. Consent of the owner is required before the tree can be
   removed.

00868/63/TA1  P/2005/1005
63 Paxton Road Chiswick W4 2QT
Removal of Eucalyptus and Leylandii within Chiswick House Conservation Area.
Decision: TREECONA  Date: 10 May 2005

Conditions
1 NON-STD
   GRANT

Reasons
1 NON-STD
   To ensure safety standards are met.

01065/A/TA1  P/2005/1032
Spencer Road/Station Gardens Chiswick W4 3SR
Felling of Robinia Pseudoacacia within Grove Park Conservation Area.
Decision: WITHDRAWN  Date: 10 May 2005
Reference

00455/46/TPOA4 P/2005/1002
46 Flanders Road Chiswick W4 1NG
Works to two Lime trees (T91 and T92) within Bedford Park TPO No 40 (T/978/10) within Bedford Park Conservation Area.
Decision: FPAPPROVAL Date: 12 May 2005

Conditions
1 NON-STD
   GRANTED
   Crown reduce two lime trees back to previous reduction points and shape. Remove deadwood and stubs over 30mm in diameter. Crown lift to statutory height over road and pavement. Prune to clear house to give a clearance of approx. 1.5m.
2 NON-STD
   INFORMATIVE
   Works should be carried out in-line with current industry best practice by a competent Arboriculturalist. A list of contractors is available from the Arboricultural Association on Tel 01794 368717 or www.trees.org.uk

Reasons
1 NON-STD
   The proposed works are not considered to harm the appearance and amenity of the locality and preserved the character of Bedford Park Conservation Area in terms of policies ENV-N.2.7 and ENV-B.2.2 of Council’s UDP, 2003.
2 NON-STD
   To ensure that safety procedures are followed.

01076/45/TA3 P/2005/1054
45 Strand-On-The-Green Chiswick W4 3PB
Removal of 3 X Cherry trees and one crab apple tree within Strand on the Green Conservation Area.
Decision: TREECONA Date: 12 May 2005

Conditions
1 NON-STD
   GRANTED
2 NON-STD
   Suitable replacements are recommended, such as ornamental trees or shrubs. Perhaps a more narrow-formed flowering cherry such as Prunus 'Amanogawa' as opposed to the more open-growing wild cherry in place. Planting advice can be provided by the Council's CIP Commercial Services on 0208 894 2677. It must be noted that replanting with the same species in the same location may be inappropriate.
3 NON-STD
   Works should be carried out in-line with current industry best practice by a competent Arboriculturalist. A list of contractors is available from the Arboricultural Association on Tel 01794 368717 or www.trees.org.uk

Reasons
1 NON-STD
   Removal of three Cherry trees and one Crab Apple tree from the rear garden within Strand on the Green Conservation Area.
2 NON-STD
   In order to safeguard the visual amenity of the Conservation Area.
3 NON-STD
   To ensure safety procedures are followed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Background papers:</th>
<th>This report has been or is due to be considered by:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This report is relevant to the following wards/areas;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnham Green</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiswick Riverside</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiswick Homefields</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Better Local Government

CHISWICK AREA COMMITTEE (PLANNING) – 25 May 2005

RESULTS OF PLANNING APPEALS

Report by: Assistant Chief Executive (Legal)

Summary
The report gives an outline of the recent appeal decisions made by the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister affecting sites within the Committee’s area. The decision letters are available for inspection in Members' Suite.

This report will now also include a commentary on each individual decision.

1. RECOMMENDATION

To note the report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO</th>
<th>SITE</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>OUTCOME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Gunnersbury Station [planning/adverts]</td>
<td>16 Mar 2005</td>
<td>Dismissed (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>20 Priory Ave, Chiswick [planning/listed building]</td>
<td>8 Apr 2005</td>
<td>Dismissed (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>59 Hartington Road, Chiswick</td>
<td>8 Apr 2005</td>
<td>Allowed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. GUNNERSBURY STATION, CHISWICK HIGH ROAD, CHISWICK

Display structure and static internally illuminated panel – refusals of planning permission and advertisement consent 28 July 2004

Appeals dismissed 16 March 2005

The Inspector identified the main issue in both appeals as the effect of the proposals on the amenity of the area.

He concluded that the proposed hoarding would be viewed more in the context of the Conservation Area in which it was to be located, than with
reference to the commercial development to the north and west. The embankment on which the structure would be located also provided a pleasant setting, which made a positive contribution to the Conservation Area as a scenic feature. The hoarding and panel would represent an unduly intrusive and commercial feature which would harm the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

Comment
This decision illustrates the demanding approach which is applicable to matters involving amenity in Conservation Areas.

2. 20 PRIORY AVENUE, CHISWICK

Conservatory – refusal of planning permission and listed building consent 20 July 2004 (delegated decisions)

Appeals dismissed 8 April 2005

In a brief decision, the Inspector concluded that:

- the proposed conservatory would not be visible from any public place, and therefore it would preserve the character and appearance of the Bedford Park Conservation Area

- in infilling the existing courtyard (or light well), the conservatory would be harmful to the setting of the listed building, by interfering with the ground floor elevation of the house and by introducing a projecting flank wall on the south side of the adjoining house. Therefore the proposal would fail to preserve the setting of the listed building (UDP policies ENV- B.2.5 and 2.7) and would also have an adverse impact on adjoining property (ENV- B.1.1)

Comment
Usually appeal decisions which address Conservation Area and listed building issues are much more detailed and lengthy. However, this Inspector clearly saw the issues raised by this proposal as straightforward.

3. 59 HARTINGTON ROAD, CHISWICK

Widening of crossover and gate – refusal of planning permission 14 May 2004 (delegated decision)

Appeal allowed 8 April 2005

The Inspector noted that under the Council’s SPG, permission was not normally to be granted for crossovers which came within the precautionary area of specific trees, which was the case in this instance (with chestnut trees
on either side). However, the widening was only occurring on the south side, and so would clearly have no effect on the tree to the north.

The chestnut to the south was a young tree, which was presumably more capable of recovering from any root damage that might be sustained during construction. There were also methods of construction available to minimise root damage. In this case, the benefit that the proposal would offer to the occupier would outweigh the risk of root damage to the southern tree (a condition was to be imposed which would require all excavation to be by hand). The proposal would also serve to protect the tree to the north.

The loss of a section of grass verge would also not be so great as to have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. A further condition would be imposed requiring the materials to be used in the gateway widening to match the existing.

Comment
There are two particularly curious aspects to this decision. First, it is unclear how the removal of a section of verge can be said to preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. Secondly, the Inspector does not see fit to elaborate on his view that the construction of the widening will help safeguard the tree to the north.

Contact: Roy Pinney
Telephone: 020 8583 2047

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Background Papers:</th>
<th>This report has been or is due to be considered by:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appeal decision letters</td>
<td>Sustainable Development Committee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This report is relevant to the following wards/areas:
All wards
Chiswick Area (Planning) Committee - 25 May 2005

Request for a zebra crossing outside the Chiswick Health Centre

Report by: Head of Street Management & Public Protection

Summary
To present to the Committee investigations into the proposal for a zebra crossing on Dolman Road, outside the Chiswick Health Centre.

1.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

That the Area Committee:

i) notes the outcome of the investigation.

ii) decides whether it wishes to site a crossing facility

iii) agrees that the lead petitioner be informed of the Committee’s decision.

2.0 BACKGROUND

2.1 At the Chiswick Area (Planning) Committee meeting on 1st September 2004 Members considered a collection of schemes for funding from the Area Committee’s Capital allocation of £50,000 for the year 2004/05.

2.2 One of the schemes for consideration was the building out of the footways on either side of Dolman Road, at the existing uncontrolled crossing facility, outside the Health Centre. This measure was proposed to overcome the sightline problems caused by cars parking near the uncontrolled crossing thus preventing pedestrians seeing the oncoming traffic and, more importantly, preventing the drivers, approaching the crossing, from seeing pedestrians waiting at the dropped kerbs.

2.3 The perception amongst visitors to the Health Center is that the uncontrolled crossing facility is considered as difficult to use by those who are not very agile and hence in their minds the facility is potentially dangerous. These anxieties lead to a petition, organized by the Chiswick Health Centre, asking for the provision of a zebra crossing.

2.4 Surveys carried out in the area showed that both the pedestrian and vehicular volumes are very low to meet the criteria, set by the Department for Transport, for the provision of a zebra crossing. Speed surveys have also shown that the 85 percentile speed is around 24mph. Furthermore, examination of the accident records has not revealed an accident problem outside the Health Centre.

2.5 Members whilst acknowledging the sound accident record felt that there is a genuine need to improve public perception of road safety at this location.
3.0 DISCUSSION

3.1 Although demands are frequently made for controlled pedestrian crossing facilities (e.g. zebra or pelican crossing) these types of crossings should only be considered at sites where positive benefits for the convenience and safety of pedestrians are likely to be obtained.

3.2 At locations where a site fails to meet the DfT’s criteria the DfT’s advice does allow for certain exemptions and suggests that a crossing may still be justified:

- where there is substantial community severance;
- at sites adjacent to community centers, homes for the elderly, infirm or blind, hospitals or clinics, outside school entrances and in busy shopping areas;
- where there are significant numbers of heavy vehicles (300 vehicles/hour during the four busiest hours).

3.3 If the Committee wishes that a crossing should be provided then it is feasible to use the location of the existing uncontrolled crossing and modify the footway to facilitate the siting of the crossing – the proposal is shown on the plan in Appendix A.

4.0 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

4.1 The estimated total cost of installing the zebra crossing, including all the ancillary works is £20,000.

4.2 The Head of Finance comments that, in addition to the £50,000 Capital allocation for 2004/05, £13,000 of the 2003/04 Capital allocation is also still available. Should the Committee decide that a zebra crossing would be provided then the cost can be funded from the remaining 2003/04 allocation and £7,000 from the 2004/05 allocation.

5.0 EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES

5.1 A crossing facility would improve conditions for pedestrians wishing to cross the road and would serve to allay anxieties amongst those who need to visit the Health Centre and are not very agile.

6.0 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPLICATIONS

6.1 The proposals would undoubtedly increase the amount of street furniture and road markings in the area but the measures would improve the environmental conditions for pedestrians.

7.0 TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS

7.1 The Traffic Manager comments that the proposals would have negligible, if no effect at all, on traffic congestion on the borough’s road network, however, due consideration must be made in minimizing any traffic disruption during construction, should the scheme be approved.

---

Background Papers:
Report to Chiswick Area (Planning) Committee - 01/09/2004 - Agenda Item 15

This report has been or is due to be considered by:
Chiswick Area (Planning) Committee - 25 May 2005

This report is relevant to the following wards/areas:
Turnham Green
PROPOSAL TO STOP UP THE HIGHWAY SERVING SUTTON COURT, CHISWICK

Report by: Head of Street Management and Public Protection

1.0 Summary
1.1 The purpose of this report is to seek approval to pursue a stopping up order under S116 and S117 of the 1980 Highways Act to stop up the highway serving the residential development known as Sutton Court, Chiswick.

2.0 RECOMMENDATIONS
2.1 Members are requested either:
   (i) to approve the request and to make a stopping up order in relation to the highway under S116 and S117 of the Highways Act 1980 or
   (ii) to refuse the request and that the applicants be informed accordingly.

3.0 BACKGROUND
3.1 A request has been received for the stopping up of the road serving the development of flats known as Sutton Court, Chiswick from Sutton Court Management Ltd on behalf of the residents of Sutton Court. According to street register records the status of the road concerned, which has access from both Fauconberg Rd and Sutton Court Rd as shown on the attached 1/1250 OS plan, is “public highway, privately maintained”.
3.2 A survey of all residents has been carried out into the proposal and of the 146 flats surveyed 87 responses were received all of which are in favour of the proposal. No responses were received objecting to the proposal.
3.3 The reason for the request to stop up the road is to “limit vehicle entry and vehicle parking at Sutton Court which has now become a major problem”. Residents are keen therefore to instigate certain access control measures for which private road status is required.

4.0 STOPPING UP PROCEDURE
4.1 There are a number of powers which can be used to stop up public highway.
4.2 Section 116/117 Highways Act 1980

Section 116 of the Act allows an application to be made to the magistrates’ court on the grounds that the highway, viz carriageway, footway or amenity area, is “unnecessary” or that it “can be diverted so as to make it nearer or more commodious to the public”. However, because the Act does not allow the owners of land themselves to make the application to the Magistrates’ Court, Section 117 will also be used which allows the owners of land to request the highway authority to make the application on their behalf. The highway authority may then, if it considers that the highway is unnecessary, make the application and may make it a condition of making the application that the persons requesting it pay the authority’s costs.
4.3 **Section 118 Highways Act 1980**
This allows an Order to be made by the local authority for footpaths and bridleways. The authority must be satisfied “that it is expedient that the path or way should be stopped up on the ground that it is not needed for public use”. A detailed procedure for giving notice of making of the Order must be followed. If there are any objections the Order must be confirmed by the Secretary of State who will either cause a Local Inquiry to be held or afford to any objectors an opportunity to be heard.

4.4 **Section 247 Town and Country Planning Act 1990**
This enables a highway, which includes footpath, to be stopped up or diverted where it is necessary to enable development which has planning permission to be carried out.

4.5 **Section 257 Town and Country Planning Act 1990**
This enables a footpath or bridleway to be stopped up or diverted where it is necessary to enable development which has planning permission to be carried out. The highway authority may then, if it considers that the Highway is unnecessary, make the application and may make it a condition of making the application that the persons requesting it pay the authority’s costs.

4.6 In this instance therefore it is proposed to use S116 and S117 of the Act. The highway concerned whilst being a public highway is privately maintained and the application has been made on the basis that the road is not necessary for the use of the public generally. The sole purpose of the road is to serve the residential development and not for enabling the movement of the public through the area and may therefore be considered unnecessary as a public highway.

5.0 **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

5.1 As indicated any costs incurred by the Council in the stopping up of the road will need to be met by the applicants who have accepted this position.

5.2 The Head of Finance comments that “if it is decided to proceed with the stopping up then any costs incurred by the Council must be recovered from the applicant.”

6.0 **ASSISTANT CHIEF EXECUTIVE (LEGAL) COMMENTS**

6.1 The comments of the Assistant Chief Executive (Legal) are contained within the report.

7.0 **EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES**

7.1 Nil

---
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1.0 **Summary**
To advise Members of the required process to establish the Highways Maintenance Programme 2005/06

2.0 **RECOMMENDATIONS**
2.1 That members agree their area priorities for roads and footways requiring priority treatment in order to establish an area programme 2005/06.

**BACKGROUND**
3.1 On 5 April 2005 the Executive Committee approved the process to establish the local road and footway resurfacing programme 2005/06 and agree apportionment of funding.

3.2 Members agreed that the limited funding available for planned maintenance be targeted at roads of more than local importance with high pedestrian and vehicular usage.

3.3 Roads of more than local importance are defined in the Local Authorities Association Code of Good Conduct and will include:
- Classified non-principal roads
- Bus routes
- High density vehicle routes
- Accident hot spots
- High density pedestrian areas
- Schools / Old peoples homes
- Hospitals / medical centres

3.4 These roads are extracted from the Corporate Prioritised List and are listed by order of priority from Condition Factors.

4.0 **HOW THE ORDER OF PRIORITY IS ARRIVED AT**
4.1 Technical assessment of the Borough’s network of footways and carriageways is undertaken in accordance with the principles of the United Kingdom Pavement Management System (UKPMS).

4.2 The collected data is processed and a condition factor allocated based on the type and extent of the defects identified. The condition factor of each road is used to produce a prioritised list.

5.0 **AREA PROGRAMMES**
5.1 Draft area programmes are extracted from the Implementation Priorities and submitted to Area Committees for approval.
5.2 Members of each Area Committee will have the opportunity to either agree their area priorities or advise of their own perceptions of those roads which should be included in the Area Programme from the implementation priorities.

5.3 This allows Area Committees for example, to propose substituting roads for others of approximately similar priority within their own area but not to impact on resources available to other areas.

5.4 This will establish a prioritised list for each Area Committee and those schemes of the highest priority will be implemented as funds are made available throughout the year.

5.5 Maintenance priorities for Chiswick are attached

6.0 PRINCIPAL ROAD PROGRAMME

6.1 The Principal Road Programme is entirely funded by Transport for London.

6.2 Following assessment a 3 year programme of carriageway resurfacing and associated footway re-construction is included in the Borough Spending Plan

6.3 The resurfacing of the carriageway to Chiswick High Road between Acton Lane and Gunnersbury Station is included in the Principal Road programme 2005/06.

7.0 STREET SCENE ENHANCEMENT SCHEMES

7.1 The street Scene Enhancement Programme is funded from Capital Credits and schemes are agreed by the Executive Committee

7.2 Schemes in the Chiswick Area which are included in the 2005/06 programme are as follows:
   Strand on the Green

8.0 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

8.1 The Head of Finance comments that LBH carries out highway maintenance works to local roads as part of its own Capital Programme and also for Principal Roads on behalf of Transport for London (TFL). In both cases, resources are limited and it is increasingly necessary to allocate them to schemes in strict priority order, as determined by a nationally accepted technical assessment.

8.2 The Council’s total Capital resources for 2005/06 are £500k for planned maintenance.

8.3 The Council’s total Revenue resources for 2005/06 are £500k for planned maintenance.

8.4 Available funding is apportioned between Area Committees in relation to the value of schemes in a particular area expressed as a % of the total value in the corporate programme.

8.5 Funding allocation is split between road and footway maintenance in proportion to their respective total values on the corporate programme. Based on current assessment the budget between carriageways and footways would be split as follows:
   Footways 55%          Roads 45%

8.6 From the above the likely budget allocation for the Chiswick area would be as follows
   Footways £112k         Roads £87k
9.0 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPLICATIONS

9.1 Proper maintenance of the Borough's infrastructure is statutory duty and essential in order to improve the quality of life for the Borough's residents, workers and visitors.

9.2 Failure to effectively maintain the highway will inevitably result in increased complaints, insurance claims, inconvenience to highway users and will put personal safety at risk.

10.0 EQUAL OPPORTUNITY IMPLICATIONS

10.1 Implementation of maintenance works will continue to provide a significant improvement to road users, in particular, people with disabilities and those with mobility problems by the installation of dropped kerbs, high visibility paving and tactile paving.

Background Papers:
Executive Committee 5 April 2005

This report has been or is due to be considered by
Head of Highways Services
Head of Finance

This report is relevant to the following wards/areas:
Turnham Green, Chiswick Riverside, Chiswick Homefields
Chiswick Area - Carriageway Priorities to Roads of more than Local Importance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRIORITY</th>
<th>ROAD NAME</th>
<th>FROM</th>
<th>TO</th>
<th>WARD</th>
<th>£K</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strand-On-The-Green</td>
<td>Spring Grove</td>
<td>Meade Close</td>
<td>Chiswick Riverside</td>
<td>58.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Edensor Road</td>
<td>Great Chertsey Road</td>
<td>Corney Road Roundabout</td>
<td>Chiswick Homefields</td>
<td>49.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Annandale Road</td>
<td>Chiswick High Road</td>
<td>Swanscombe Road</td>
<td>Chiswick Homefields</td>
<td>31.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Belmont Terrace</td>
<td>Belmont Grove</td>
<td>Clifton Gardens</td>
<td>Turnham Green</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Belmont Road</td>
<td>Chiswick High Road</td>
<td>Essex Place</td>
<td>Turnham Green</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Duke Road</td>
<td>Chiswick High Road</td>
<td>End</td>
<td>Turnham Green</td>
<td>77.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Barrowgate Road</td>
<td>Sutton Court Road</td>
<td>Duke's Avenue</td>
<td>Turnham Green</td>
<td>74.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Beverley Road</td>
<td>End by No 1</td>
<td>Netheravon Road</td>
<td>Chiswick Homefields</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Chiswick Common Road</td>
<td>Chiswick Common Road</td>
<td>Turnham Green Terrace</td>
<td>Turnham Green</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Brooks Lane</td>
<td>Thames Road</td>
<td>Waldeck Road</td>
<td>Chiswick Riverside</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Abinger Road</td>
<td>Bath Road</td>
<td>County Boundary</td>
<td>Chiswick Homefields</td>
<td>69.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Chardin Road</td>
<td>Elliott Road</td>
<td>End</td>
<td>Turnham Green</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Barley Mow Passage</td>
<td>Heathfield Terrace</td>
<td>Chiswick High Road</td>
<td>Turnham Green</td>
<td>25.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Belmont Terrace</td>
<td>Bridge Street</td>
<td>Belmont Grove</td>
<td>Turnham Green</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Sutton Lane North</td>
<td>Walpole Gardens</td>
<td>Chiswick High Road</td>
<td>Turnham Green</td>
<td>33.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Devonshire Road</td>
<td>Chiswick High Road A315</td>
<td>Hogarth Lane Roundabout</td>
<td>Turnham Green</td>
<td>99.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Chiswick Common Road</td>
<td>Clifton Gardens</td>
<td>Chiswick Common Road</td>
<td>Turnham Green</td>
<td>53.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Grove Park Road</td>
<td>Riverview Grove</td>
<td>Grove Park Road</td>
<td>Chiswick Riverside</td>
<td>66.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Acton Lane</td>
<td>Chiswick High Road</td>
<td>Chiswick Road</td>
<td>Turnham Green</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Acton Lane</td>
<td>Chiswick Road</td>
<td>Boundary</td>
<td>Turnham Green</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Acton Lane</td>
<td>Boundary</td>
<td>Chiswick Road</td>
<td>Turnham Green</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Linden Passage</td>
<td>Duke Road</td>
<td>Linden Gardens</td>
<td>Turnham Green</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Chiswick Area - Footway Priorities To Roads Of More Than Local Importance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRIORITY</th>
<th>ROAD NAME</th>
<th>FROM</th>
<th>TO</th>
<th>WARD</th>
<th>£K</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Barrowgate Road</td>
<td>Sutton Court Road</td>
<td>Duke's Avenue</td>
<td>Tumham Green</td>
<td>98.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Beverley Road</td>
<td>End By No 1</td>
<td>Netheravon Road</td>
<td>Chiswick Homefields</td>
<td>66.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Chiswick Common Road</td>
<td>Chiswick Common Road</td>
<td>Turnham Green Terrace</td>
<td>Tumham Green</td>
<td>37.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Brooks Lane</td>
<td>Thames Road</td>
<td>Waldeck Road</td>
<td>Chiswick Riverside</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Abinger Road</td>
<td>Bath Road</td>
<td>County Boundary</td>
<td>Chiswick Homefields</td>
<td>92.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Belmont Terrace</td>
<td>Bridge Street</td>
<td>Belmont Grove</td>
<td>Tumham Green</td>
<td>34.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Sutton Lane North</td>
<td>Walpole Gardens</td>
<td>Chiswick High Road</td>
<td>Tumham Green</td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Devonshire Road</td>
<td>Chiswick High Road A315</td>
<td>Hogarth Lane Roundabout</td>
<td>Tumham Green</td>
<td>132.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Chiswick Common Road</td>
<td>Clifton Gardens</td>
<td>Chiswick Common Road</td>
<td>Tumham Green</td>
<td>71.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Grove Park Road</td>
<td>Riverview Grove</td>
<td>Grove Park Road</td>
<td>Chiswick Riverside</td>
<td>89.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Linden Passage</td>
<td>Duke Road</td>
<td>Linden Gardens</td>
<td>Tumham Green</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Annandale Road</td>
<td>Chiswick High Road</td>
<td>Swanscombe Road</td>
<td>Chiswick Homefields</td>
<td>41.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Edensor Road</td>
<td>Great Chertsey Road</td>
<td>Corney Road Roundabout</td>
<td>Chiswick Homefields</td>
<td>66.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Chardin Road</td>
<td>Elliott Road</td>
<td>End</td>
<td>Tumham Green</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Belmont Terrace</td>
<td>Belmont Grove</td>
<td>Clifton Gardens</td>
<td>Tumham Green</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Belmont Road</td>
<td>Chiswick High Road</td>
<td>Essex Place</td>
<td>Tumham Green</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Duke Road</td>
<td>Chiswick High Road</td>
<td>End</td>
<td>Tumham Green</td>
<td>102.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Barley Mow Passage</td>
<td>Heathfield Terrace</td>
<td>Chiswick High Road</td>
<td>Tumham Green</td>
<td>33.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Thames Road</td>
<td>Meade Close</td>
<td>Riverview Grove</td>
<td>Chiswick Riverside</td>
<td>108.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Strand-On-The-Green</td>
<td>Spring Grove</td>
<td>Meade Close</td>
<td>Chiswick Riverside</td>
<td>78.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Sutton Court Road</td>
<td>Heathfield Terrace</td>
<td>Great West Road</td>
<td>Tumham Green</td>
<td>85.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Sutton Court Road</td>
<td>Staveley Road</td>
<td>Great West Road</td>
<td>Chiswick Riverside</td>
<td>63.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Burlington Lane</td>
<td>Staveley Road</td>
<td>Park Road</td>
<td>Chiswick Riverside</td>
<td>63.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Burlington Lane</td>
<td>Great Chertsey Road</td>
<td>Staveley Road</td>
<td>Chiswick Riverside</td>
<td>76.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Addendum Report of the Borough Planning Officer

Chiswick Area Planning Committee 25th May 2005

Agenda Item 8 Page 27
331-335 Chiswick High Road
Additional consultation responses received to add to section 4.0 page 29

4.3 Bishops Close Residents Association have no objection to the principle of change of use from timber yard to residential. The height of the building, to be the same as the existing, is acceptable. However, they have concerns that the rear wall will be closer to the properties of 5, 6 and 7 Bishops Close. Lack of car parking will create additional stress on already overcrowded streets. Loss of the timber store in the rear is sad, as it is an attractive building, and the possibility of listing it has been discussed.

Response – The rear wall of the flats will be 6m closer to Bishops Close than the existing rear wall. However, it will still be 33m from the front of the Bishops Close properties. The development will be car free, all future occupants not being able to purchase permits within the Controlled Parking Zone. The timber store has been thoroughly assessed by the Councils Conservation Officer, who does not consider that it is worthy of listing.

4.4 Metropolitan Police comment that the proposed development would not achieve Secure By Design as there is a lack of defensible space to front and rear ground floor units and recessed front and rear units.

Response – The existing rear wall around the communal garden area will be retained. This rear wall fronts Bishops Close, a gated community, so it is considered that there is defensible space to ground floor rear units. At the front, side and front walls are proposed to enclose a front area and separate the public footpath from the front windows of the ground floor units, for privacy and security reasons.

4.5 Environment Agency have no objection to the proposed development

4.6 Para 6.24 is incorrect and should be deleted from this report

Agenda Item 7 Page 20
8 Belmont Terrace (Ref 107/8/P2)

Paragraph 4.1
Approved dimensions “the dormer was set down 0.6m”
“Proposed reduction (This application)
The dormer is to be set down 0.3m below the ridge; set up 1.3m above the eaves, and set in 1.2m from the party wall”.

Throughout the report, the approved dormer was to be set down 0.6m, the dormer as built, and as proposed to be retained, is set down 0.3m.